

Factors Affecting Workplace Stress in Examining the Stress Management Practices of the Employees in the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon

¹James Japhet J. Balingcasag, ¹Jebsam V. Playto, ¹Lean Shein L. Labial,

¹Meshelle B. Nnganlag, & ²Jessa J. Salait, MPSM, MBM

¹Bukidnon State University, Malitbog Campus

¹Bukidnon State University, Philippines

Received 13th of January; Accepted 11th of February; Published online 30th March 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63941/DIT.ADSimrj.2025.03>

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine the factors that affect workplace stress among employees in a local government unit. The study will investigate the various stressors experienced by employees, such as heavy workloads, leadership style, work environment, and health concerns. It will also examine the various stress management practices employed by employees, such as employee engagement and commitment to the organization. The study may also provide valuable insights into the factors that contribute to workplace stress, as well as the coping mechanisms employed by employees. This study involves the employees in the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon. It covered research design, sampling techniques, instrumentation, and statistical treatments. This study used a quantitative research design with 62 respondents. Additionally, the chapter provided information on the collection implementation, including relevant details about the participants and the subsequent procedures. The result of the study revealed that respondents were predominantly female, with the majority aged 20–40 years old, and possessing a college degree or higher. Almost equally divided between single and married individuals. More than half of the respondents earn between Php 9,520.00 and Php 19,040.00 monthly, which may be considered moderate for LGU positions. A large number of respondents have been in service for 0–5 years, showing a relatively new or recently hired workforce. In addition, there is an equal distribution between permanent and casual employees in both categories. In terms of workloads, respondents indicated that workload demands contribute moderately to their stress, with an average mean of 2.55. While most employees agree that their workload is often too demanding, leading to long hours and late nights, they also reported that workload pressures can interfere with their ability to prioritize tasks effectively or engage fully with their work. Regarding leadership style, the data revealed that employees generally agree that supervisors provide clear feedback and encourage open communication, with an average mean of 3.18. This study has provided a comprehensive analysis of the factors contributing to workplace stress and the stress management strategies employed by employees in a local government unit (LGU). The findings reveal that employees in the LGU face various stressors, with workloads being a prominent factor. High demands and long working hours contribute significantly to workplace stress, although other factors such as leadership style, work environment, and health concerns also play essential roles. Leadership style, particularly effective feedback and support from supervisors, and a work environment that fosters collaboration and conflict resolution, were found to have a moderate influence on managing stress.

Keywords: *Workloads, Leadership Style, Work Environment, Health Concerns, Employee Engagement, Commitment to the Organization.*

INTRODUCTION

In today's high-speed work environment, stress has become a prevalent issue that has a negative impact on the productivity and overall well-being of employees. Due to the demanding nature of their roles, employees at the Local Government Unit are frequently confronted with high levels of stress. It is crucial to identify effective stress management strategies that can enhance employee performance. The prevalence of work-related stress is on the rise among employees in various organizations (Kim & Jung, 2022). Despite being a relatively recent phenomenon in modern workplaces, stress has escalated

to the extent that it is almost tangible in nearly all public service positions. The presence of stress has led to both positive and negative consequences in various situations. While some level of stress is essential for personal development and progress, excessive stress can negatively impact a person's well-being (O'Connor et al., 2021). Recent increases in work-related stress have contributed to low employee morale, which is often a response to specific triggers such as technological advancements, changes in society, and lifestyle (Li et al., 2021). As defined by the American Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, stress is the adverse physical and psychological reaction to an individual's lack of resources and skills to meet job demands (Wu et al., 2021). Research suggests that stress can be a double-edged sword, leading to both increased productivity and inefficiency. While it can spur individuals to work harder and produce better results, it can also impede performance if not managed effectively.

Furthermore, individuals under stress may discover new opportunities, ultimately enhancing their work performance. Insufficient knowledge about managing stress resulted in problems such as increased anxiety and fear of the unknown, poor communication abilities during interactions with callers, and a doubtful attitude towards the callers' understanding, all of which worsened as the workload increased (Velana & Rinkenauer, 2021). Studies have shown that work-related stress has adverse effects on employees' health and their ability to cope with stress at work. These consequences lead to reduced job satisfaction, increased health risks, and decreased employee productivity. The sources of workplace stress vary based on the environment and may stem from organizational factors like workload and compensation, functional factors such as the physical work environment, decision making, and feedback, or personal factors like individual characteristics, physical health, and mental well-being (Al-Zoubi et al., 2024). While there has been extensive research on the impact of stress on memory, there is less understanding of how stress influences decision-making abilities, especially in high-pressure situations. The impact of ambiguity, perceived stress, time constraints, and team support on decision-making in high-risk environments has been the focus of research.

However, there is still much to explore to fully grasp how their combined influence affects decision outcomes (Younas & Khanum, 2024). In this study, we are examining how stress influences the importance of regret to better understand the impact of stress on emotional decision-making. Regret, due to its reliance on counterfactual reasoning, is considered one of the primary emotional factors that influence decision-making (Wu et al., 2020). Individuals often compare the outcomes of their decisions—what "could have been" or "counterfactual outcomes"—to make decisions. Stress and regret may have a connection, as stress could impact this process. Decision-making is a rational process that requires knowledge of potential solutions and an understanding of the problem at hand. More accurate information systems lead to improved decision-making and are therefore seen as dimensions or indicators of decision-making.

The theory was anchored to the Multidimensional Theory of (Mashlach 1993) and (Jackson 1981 - 1986). According to this theory, burnout is an individual stress experience embedded in the context of complex social relationships, and it involves a person's conception of both self and others. Emotional Exhaustion refers to the feeling of being emotionally overextended and depleted of one's emotional resources. The major sources of this exhaustion are work overload and personal conflict at work. Workers feel drained and used up, our source of replenishment. They lack enough energy to face another day or another person in need. The emotional exhaustion component represents the basic individual stress dimensions of burnout. Depersonalization refers to a negative, cynical, or excessively detached response to other people, which often includes a loss of idealism. It usually develops in response to the overload of emotional exhaustion and is self-proactive at first, an emotional buffer of "detached concern". But the risk is that the detachment can turn into exhaustion.

The personalization component represents the interpersonal dimension of burnout. Reduced personal accomplishment refers to a decline in feelings of competence and productivity at work. This lowered sense of self-efficacy has been linked to depression and inability to cope with the demands of the job, and it can be exacerbated by a lack of support and opportunities to develop professionally. Workers experience a growing sense of inadequacy about their ability to help clients, and this may result in a self-imposed verdict of failure. The personal accomplishment component represents the self-evaluation dimension of burnout. The significance of this three-dimensional approach is that it places the individual stress experience within a social context. What has been distinctive about burnout (as opposed to other kinds of stress reactions) is the interpersonal framework of the phenomenon. The centrality of relationships at work, whether it can be relationships with clients, colleagues, or supervisors, has always been at the heart of the discipline of burnout. These relationships are a source of both emotional strains and rewards; they can be a resource for coping with job stress, and they often bear the brunt of the negative effects of burnout. Thus, if one looks at burnout out of context and simply focuses on the individual exhaustion component, one would lose sight of the phenomenon entirely.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Research Design

In this study, the researchers utilized a quantitative research design to investigate the role of stress management practices in enhancing employee decision-making within the Local Government Unit. Quantitative research focused on numbers, logic, and maintaining an objective perspective. Its main goal was to draw definitive conclusions by quantifying the issue and comprehending its scope, seeking outcomes applicable to a broader population. Additionally, a descriptive research method was employed as the study intended to outline the influence of stress management practices on enhancing employee decision-making in the Local Government Unit.

Research Locale

The research was conducted in the province of Bukidnon, particularly in the Municipality of Malitbog, residing in Barangay Poblacion. To minimize complications, the researchers chose to focus solely on the government sector, specifically the Local Government Unit, selecting both permanent and casual employees. The study focused on eighty-six (86) employees across all departments of the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon. The target respondents for the study were 62 individuals.

Respondents

To determine the sample size, the researchers utilized the Raosoft sample size calculator, a software designed to calculate the required sample size for research or surveys. Using this tool, they determined that, with a confidence level of 95%, the survey would require a minimum of sixty-two (62) respondents. This was the minimum recommended size for the survey. The sixty-two respondents were randomly selected based on demographic information such as age, educational attainment, marital status, monthly income, sex, years of service, and employee status.

Research Instrument

The survey questionnaire was adapted from various sources and literature related to the topic. It was divided into three parts: the first part collected demographic information about the respondents; the second part focused on factors affecting workplace stress in examining the stress management practices of employees in the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon; and the third part aimed to identify the factors of stress management of the employees. This instrument enabled the researchers to gather data directly and efficiently. It included optional participant details such as age, educational

attainment, marital status, sex, monthly income, years of service, and employee status.

To ensure validity, the questionnaire's content and structure were reviewed and commented on by five expert validators. After receiving suggestions and corrections, the researchers refined the questionnaire accordingly. Additionally, pilot testing was carried out with fifty (50) Job Order employees from the Local Government Unit who were not part of the sample to further improve the reliability of the questionnaire. The aim of the pilot testing was to identify any potential issues with the questionnaire's design, instructions, and clarity. The findings from the pilot test were utilized to further refine the questionnaire.

Procedure

The researchers wrote a letter to the Municipal Mayor's Office requesting permission to survey the target respondents. Once approval was granted, the researchers personally delivered another note along with the survey questionnaire to the respondents to collect the needed data. The respondents were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaire and were free to ask questions, comment, or provide feedback.

The data collected was thoroughly checked, recorded, and tabulated for analysis, interpretation, and findings. The researchers ensured that ethical considerations were observed during the data gathering process to guarantee the respondents' welfare and respect their rights to privacy and confidentiality.

The researcher opted to employ a four-point Likert scale for scoring. This decision allowed the respondents to express their opinions and attitudes toward the study. Simultaneously, it enabled the researcher to obtain specific responses and comprehend the respondents' perspectives on the current issues being studied.

Table 1
Four-Point Likert Scale

Value	Range	Description	Interpretation
4	3.25-4.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Stress
3	2.50-3.24	Agree	Moderately Stress
2	1.75-2.49	Disagree	Somewhat Stress
1	1.00-1.74	Strongly Agree	Low Stress

The analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the study were statistically analyzed using descriptive statistics. The target population of this study focused on the employees of the Local Government Unit, selectively including permanent and casual employees. The respondents comprised seventy-three (73) employees, representing ninety-five (95%) of the total population, with only sixty-two (62) serving as the respondents among selected permanent to casual employees at the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon. The researchers used weighted mean and standard deviation to describe the factors affecting the workplace stress in examining the stress management practices of the employees in the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon. To identify the factors affecting workplace stress, the researchers utilized the Raosoft sampling statistical tools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data collected and provides an in-depth analysis and interpretation of the results based on the study's objectives. It explores the demographic profile of employees in the local government unit (LGU) in terms of age, educational attainment, marital status, monthly income, sex, years in service, and employment status. Furthermore, it identifies the primary factors contributing to workplace stress, including workloads, leadership style, work environment, and health concerns. Lastly, the chapter examines the stress management strategies practiced by employees, focusing on their engagement and commitment to the organization. These findings aim to offer insights that can guide interventions to promote employee well-being and improve organizational performance.

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of;

1.1 Age

1.2 Educational Attainment

1.3 Marital Status

1.4 Monthly Income

1.5 Sex

1.6 Years in Service

1.7 Employment Status

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' demographic profiles. The demographic data provides a foundational understanding of the respondents' backgrounds, which is essential for analyzing workplace trends and employee experiences within the local government unit. The majority of respondents fall within the age range of 20–40 years old, accounting for 75.8% of the total population. This suggests a relatively young workforce in the local government unit (LGU), which may contribute to adaptability and energy in the workplace. According to Salas-Vallina et al. (2022), younger employees tend to be more open to organizational change and innovation. The smaller percentage of those aged 41 years and above (24.2%) still plays a critical role in offering experience and institutional knowledge. This blend of youth and maturity can enhance organizational learning and continuity. A significant proportion of the respondents are college graduates (71.0%), with a further 16.1% holding a master's degree, highlighting the educational preparedness of LGU employees. This aligns with the observation of Al-Adwan et al. (2020) that higher educational attainment is associated with better problem-solving skills and higher work performance in public institutions. The presence of only 1.6% high school graduates indicates that most LGU positions likely require at least a college-level background. Educational qualifications are essential for the complex administrative tasks expected in public service.

The data also suggest ongoing professional development as some staff pursue graduate studies. The respondents are almost equally divided between single (53.2%) and married (46.8%) individuals. This balanced representation may influence how work-life balance policies are shaped within the organization. Married employees often prioritize stability and long-term job security, as suggested by Rehman et al. (2019), while single employees might be more flexible with work schedules or task assignments. Understanding marital status can help management provide targeted support systems, especially in stress management and employee engagement programs. Such demographic insights are critical in tailoring inclusive workplace policies. More than half of the respondents (51.6%) earn

between Php 9,520.00 and Php 19,040.00 monthly, which may be considered moderate for LGU positions. Only 1.6% earn above Php 66,640.00, indicating limited access to higher-paying roles within the unit. Income level has a strong correlation with job satisfaction and employee retention, as noted by Raza et al. (2020). Lower income brackets may contribute to financial stress, affecting productivity and well-being. This data can inform salary benchmarking and financial support programs in public service. The workforce is predominantly female (69.4%), reflecting the increasing participation of women in local government roles. This supports findings by Rincón and Barrientos (2018), who emphasized the growing gender inclusivity in public sector employment.

Table 1**Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Demographic Profile**

Characteristics	Specifications	Frequency	Percentage
Age	20-30 years old	24	38.7
	31-40 years old	23	37.1
	41-55 years old	11	17.7
	56-65 years old	4	6.5
Educational Attainment	College Level	7	11.3
	College Graduate	44	71.0
	Master's Degree	10	16.1
	High School Graduate	1	1.6
Marital Status	Married	29	46.8
	Single	33	53.2
Monthly Income	Less than Php 9,520.00	17	27.4
	Php 9,520.00 - Php 19,040.00	32	51.6
	Php 19,040.00 - Php 38,080.00	7	11.3
	Php 38,080.00 - Php 66,640.00	5	8.1
	Php 66,640.00 - Php 114,240.00	1	1.6
Sex	Female	43	69.4
	Male	19	30.6
Years In Service	0-5 years	43	69.4
	6-10 years	7	11.3
	11-15 years	7	11.3
	21 years or more	5	8.1
Employee Status	Permanent	31	50.0
	Casual	31	50.0

Despite this progress, it is important to ensure that both genders have equal access to leadership roles and professional development. Gender balance can also influence organizational culture and decision-making styles. Ensuring inclusivity contributes to a more equitable and productive workplace. A large number of respondents (69.4%) have been in service for 0–5 years, showing a relatively new or recently hired workforce. This could be indicative of recent hiring initiatives or turnover within the LGU. As per the study by Ng and Feldman (2018), new employees bring fresh perspectives but may require more training and mentoring. The smaller number of respondents with more than 10 years of service suggests fewer senior employees available to pass on institutional knowledge. Balancing new talent with experienced staff is vital for organizational growth and stability. The data shows an equal distribution between permanent and casual employees, with both categories making up 50.0% of the total. Casual employment may indicate budget constraints or the need for flexible staffing arrangements. However, as highlighted by Jena and Pradhan (2018), permanent employment often contributes to higher commitment and morale among workers. Casual employees might face job insecurity, which can impact their engagement and productivity. Ensuring fair treatment and development opportunities for all employment types is essential for a harmonious workplace.

2. What are the primary factors contributing to the workplace stress of the employees in the local government unit (LGU)?

2.1 Workloads

2.2 Leadership Style

2.3 Work Environment

2.5 Health Concerns

Table 2 presents the primary factors contributing to workplace stress among LGU employees: focus on workloads. The general mean score, reflecting the overall trend, is 2.55 (SD = 0.80) for workload-related items falls under the "Agree" category, interpreted as having a moderate influence on workplace stress among LGU employees. This implies that while workloads are not overwhelmingly burdensome, they are still a consistent source of stress for many. Moderate stress can impact productivity, decision-making, and employee morale if not addressed properly. Recent studies, such as those by Huang et al. (2019), emphasize that sustained moderate workload stress can escalate into burnout if support systems are lacking. Therefore, maintaining balanced workloads and promoting efficient task management are crucial for local government organizations. It is clear that the item with the greatest rating is the statement "I am required to work long hours to complete my tasks," which recorded the highest mean score of 2.76 (SD = 0.90), also under the "Agree" level with a moderate influence. This suggests that extended working hours are one of the most significant contributors to workplace stress among LGU personnel. Long hours have been linked to both mental and physical health issues, including fatigue and anxiety (Zhou et al., 2021).

Employees working overtime frequently report reduced satisfaction and diminished work-life balance. To address this, LGUs should consider promoting time management training and evaluating staffing needs to avoid overburdening their employees. In contrast, the item "I believe that my workload demands sometimes prevent me from fully understanding the big picture or strategic direction of my organization" received the lowest mean score of 2.39 (SD= 0.75), falling under the "Disagree" category with a low influence. This indicates that employees generally do not feel disconnected from their organization's mission despite their workloads. Effective internal communication and clear leadership likely help employees maintain strategic awareness even under stress. A study by Park and Kim (2020) supports this by showing that transparent communication can reduce the negative effects of job stress

and enhance organizational alignment. Therefore, LGUs that maintain clear communication channels may successfully buffer some of the adverse effects of high workloads.

Table 2
Primary Factors Contributing to Workplace Stress among LGU employees: Focus on Workloads

Workloads	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
My workload is often too demanding for me to handle.	2.69	0.71	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am required to work long hours to complete my tasks.	2.76	0.90	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that my workload demands often result in long hours and late nights at work.	2.52	0.86	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that my workload demands sometimes lead to conflicts or tensions within my team.	2.44	0.82	Disagree	Low Influence
I feel that my workload demands sometimes prevent me from being fully present and engaged with my work.	2.61	0.84	Agree	Moderate Influence
My workload demands sometimes cause me to sacrifice my personal life or well-being in order to meet deadlines or expectations.	2.55	0.82	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that my workload demands often lead to feelings of anxiety or worry about my job performance.	2.58	0.78	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that my workload demands sometimes make it difficult to prioritize and manage multiple tasks effectively.	2.52	0.76	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that my workload demands sometimes cause me to overlook important details or miss deadlines.	2.47	0.72	Disagree	Low Influence
I believe that my workload demands sometimes prevent me from fully understanding the big picture or strategic direction of my organization.	2.39	0.75	Disagree	Low Influence
Average Mean	2.55	0.80	Agree	Moderate Influence

Legend: 1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree (Very Low Influence), 1.75-2.49 Disagree (Low Influence), 2.50-3.24 Agree (Moderate Influence), 3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree (Very High Influence)

Table 3
Primary Factors Contributing to Workplace Stress among LGU Employees: Focus on Leadership Style

Leadership Style	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
My supervisor provides clear and constructive feedback on my performance.	3.15	0.72	Agree	Moderate Influence
My supervisor encourages clear communication.	3.18	0.67	Agree	Moderate Influence
My preferred leadership style is direct and authoritative.	3.03	0.70	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that my team members are motivated and engaged in their work.	3.10	0.67	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that my leadership style is effective in achieving my organization's goals.	3.23	0.53	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that leaders should be open to feedback and criticism.	3.29	0.66	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I value innovation and creativity from my team members.	3.35	0.66	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
My superior encourages my team to be innovative and creative in their work.	3.29	0.64	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I feel supported and empowered by my superior's leadership.	3.13	0.74	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel motivated and inspired by my superior's approach to problem solving.	3.10	0.72	Agree	Moderate Influence
Average Mean	3.18	0.67	Agree	Moderate Influence

Legend: 1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree (Very Low Influence), 1.75-2.49 Disagree (Low Influence), 2.50-3.24 Agree (Moderate Influence), 3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree (Very High Influence)

Table 3 presents the primary factors contributing to workplace stress among LGU employees: focus on leadership style. The average mean for leadership style-related items is 3.18 (SD = 0.67), which falls within the "Agree" category and indicates a moderate influence on workplace stress among LGU employees. This suggests that leadership practices in the LGU moderately affect how employees experience stress at work. Leadership is a key driver of organizational climate and employee well-being, and moderate levels of influence mean that leaders have room to strengthen their impact. As noted by Skakon et al. (2018), supportive leadership that fosters clear communication and feedback can alleviate job-related stress and enhance employee morale.

Therefore, continuous development in leadership styles can significantly contribute to reducing stress levels in the workplace. The item with the highest mean is "I value innovation and creativity from my team members", which scored 3.35 (SD = 0.66), interpreted as "Strongly Agree" and showing a very high influence. This reflects a strong belief in the importance of empowering employees to be innovative and creative, which is a hallmark of transformational leadership. Studies show that encouraging innovation contributes to higher engagement and lower stress by giving employees autonomy and a sense of ownership (Kim & Beehr, 2021). Additionally, when leaders promote innovation, it builds a positive culture that buffers stress and fosters collaboration. For LGUs, supporting creative thinking can be a powerful strategy to improve both performance and well-being. On the other hand, the item with the lowest mean is "My preferred leadership style is direct and authoritative", with a score of 3.03 (SD = 0.70), still interpreted as "Agree" with a moderate influence. Although still moderately influential, this score suggests that a more traditional or top-down leadership style is less favored or less impactful in mitigating stress compared to participative or empowering styles. Authoritative leadership may be effective in certain structured environments but can limit employee autonomy and increase stress if overused (Nguyen et al., 2020). Hence, a balanced approach that incorporates openness and empowerment may be more suitable in public sector settings like LGUs. Encouraging leaders to blend structure with flexibility may help optimize performance and reduce stress.

Table 4 presents the primary factors contributing to workplace stress among LGU employees: focus on the work environment. The cumulative average score for the set of items is 3.08 (SD = 0.64), indicating that LGU employees generally agree that their work environment has a moderate influence on their experience of workplace stress. This suggests that while the work environment does not contribute extreme levels of stress, it remains a consistent factor that can affect employee well-being. A moderately supportive work environment may still result in occasional conflicts, communication breakdowns, or resource limitations that can trigger stress responses. According to Bakker and Demerouti (2018), a balanced work environment with fair conflict resolution and open communication channels plays a vital role in minimizing chronic stress. For LGUs, maintaining such a balance is critical in fostering productivity and reducing burnout. From the data, the item with the largest mean score is "I believe that conflicts are resolved in a way that minimizes the negative impact on relationships and morale in my work environment," received a mean of 3.18 (SD = 0.56), indicating moderate influence but on the higher end of the scale. This suggests that employees view conflict resolution processes as effective in preserving team cohesion and morale. Conflict, when managed constructively, can foster innovation, trust, and collaboration in the workplace (Alvarado-Alvarez et al., 2021). When employees feel that their relationships are protected during resolution processes, it leads to a more resilient and engaged workforce. This is a strong point for LGUs and should be consistently reinforced through leadership development and HR practices. From the findings, the item with the weakest mean score is "I believe that conflicts between different departments or teams are managed effectively in my work environment," had a mean of 2.95 (SD = 0.73), still within the "Agree" range but reflecting a slightly weaker perception of interdepartmental conflict management. This may indicate that cross-functional communication or collaboration poses more challenges than within-team

interactions. Interdepartmental misunderstandings and lack of shared goals often cause friction that, if unresolved, can lead to stress and inefficiencies (Martínez-Córcoles & Stephanou, 2020). For LGUs, strengthening communication systems between departments could reduce stress and create a more cohesive and integrated work environment.

Table 4
Primary Factors Contributing to Workplace Stress among LGU Employees: Focus on Work Environment

Work Environment	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
I feel that conflicts among colleagues are effectively resolved in my work environment.	3.06	0.67	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that conflicts between different departments or teams are managed effectively in my work environment.	2.95	0.73	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that conflicts are addressed in a timely and appropriate manner in my work environment.	3.02	0.71	Agree	Moderate Influence
My work environment provides adequate support and resources for managing and resolving conflicts.	3.06	0.67	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that conflicts are generally avoided or minimized in my work environment.	3.15	0.57	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that conflicts are treated as learning opportunities in my work environment.	3.13	0.59	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that conflicts are addressed in a way that promotes mutual understanding and respect in my work environment.	3.06	0.65	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel that my work environment is characterized by a culture of honesty and transparency when addressing conflicts.	3.16	0.61	Agree	Moderate Influence
My work environment promotes open dialogue and constructive feedback in addressing conflicts.	3.03	0.63	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe that conflicts are resolved in a way that minimizes the negative impact on relationships and morale in my work environment.	3.18	0.56	Agree	Moderate Influence
Average Mean	3.08	0.64	Agree	Moderate Influence

Legend: 1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree (Very Low Influence), 1.75-2.49 Disagree (Low Influence), 2.50-3.24 Agree (Moderate Influence), 3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree (Very High Influence)

Table 5

Primary Factors Contributing to Workplace Stress among LGU Employees: Focus on Health Concerns

Health Concerns	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
I feel energized most days.	3.16	0.68	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel anxious or worried frequently	2.92	0.73	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe my stress levels are manageable.	3.05	0.71	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe my mental health is good.	3.23	0.64	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am managing my stress effectively.	3.18	0.56	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am regularly engaging in preventative health practices.	3.11	0.58	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe I have access to quality healthcare.	3.08	0.73	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am able to maintain healthy relationships	3.19	0.57	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe my sleep is sufficient and restful.	3.08	0.64	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am experiencing significant sleep disturbances.	2.97	0.68	Agree	Moderate Influence
Average Mean	3.10	0.65	Agree	Moderate Influence

Legend: 1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree (Very Low Influence), 1.75-2.49 Disagree (Low Influence), 2.50-3.24 Agree (Moderate Influence), 3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree (Very High Influence)

Table 5 presents the primary factors contributing to workplace stress among LGU employees: focus on health concerns. Considering all items, the overall mean value is 3.10 (SD = 0.65), suggesting that LGU employees generally agree that health concerns have a moderate influence on their workplace stress. This indicates that while health issues are not the most dominant stressors, they remain a consistent factor that affects well-being and performance. Physical health, sleep quality, and mental well-being are interconnected with job satisfaction and stress levels. As noted by Day and Randell (2018), maintaining a healthy workforce requires ongoing organizational support for both physical and psychological health. Thus, LGUs should ensure access to health services, wellness programs, and mental health resources to support their employees holistically. According to the findings, the item with the highest assessment score is “I believe my mental health is good,” with a mean of 3.23 (SD =

0.64), reflecting a moderate influence but close to the "Strongly Agree" range. This is a positive indicator that many employees feel mentally well despite the stressors at work. Mental health resilience is a key protective factor against occupational stress and burnout, particularly in public service roles (Van der Feltz-Cornelis et al., 2020).

It also shows that employees may have access to coping strategies or supportive work environments that buffer mental strain. Maintaining and reinforcing such positive perceptions is essential for long-term employee satisfaction and retention. Based on the evaluation, the item with the minimum score is "I feel anxious or worried frequently," with a mean of 2.92 (SD = 0.73), still within the "Agree" category but indicating that anxiety is a recurring concern among employees. While not severe, frequent anxiety can accumulate over time and contribute to diminished focus, emotional exhaustion, and absenteeism. According to Giorgi et al. (2020), workplace stressors that trigger frequent worry often stem from job insecurity, high demands, or lack of support. LGUs should consider early intervention programs, mental health screenings, and workshops on emotional regulation to help mitigate these feelings and promote well-being.

Table 6

Stress Management Strategies Practiced by LGU Employees: Focus on Employee Engagement

Employee Engagement	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
I am committed to my work and the institution goals.	3.37	0.66	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I feel motivated to contribute to the institution success.	3.39	0.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I feel supported by my colleagues.	3.26	0.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I believe my work is meaningful and makes a difference.	3.35	0.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I believe my manager provides me with constructive feedback.	3.19	0.62	Agree	Moderate Influence
I believe there are opportunities for growth and development within the institution.	3.31	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am actively involved in improving processes and efficiency.	3.21	0.58	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am engaged in the institution overall mission and vision.	3.34	0.57	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am satisfied with my current role and responsibilities.	3.26	0.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am likely to recommend this institution as a great place to work.	3.26	0.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
Average Mean	3.29	0.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence

Legend: 1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree (Very Low Influence), 1.75-2.49 Disagree (Low Influence), 2.50-3.24 Agree (Moderate Influence), 3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree (Very High Influence)

Table 6 presents the stress management strategies practiced by LGU employees: focus on employee engagement. The average mean score of 3.29 ($SD = 0.61$) indicates that employee engagement has a very high influence on stress management among LGU employees. This suggests that highly engaged employees are more likely to manage workplace stress effectively by feeling connected to their work and organizational goals. Engagement at this level can significantly enhance job satisfaction, resilience, and productivity, while reducing burnout. According to Harter et al. (2020), employee engagement is one of the most powerful predictors of workplace well-being and overall performance, making it an essential component of organizational success, particularly in public service settings. The highest-rated item is "I feel motivated to contribute to the institution's success," with a mean of 3.39 ($SD = 0.55$), indicating very high influence. This reflects that LGU employees are deeply committed to contributing to the organization's goals, suggesting a high sense of responsibility and ownership of their work. Such motivation is a critical factor in reducing stress, as it fosters a positive work environment where individuals feel valued and purposeful (Macey & Schneider, 2018). It also highlights the importance of leadership practices that encourage intrinsic motivation, which has been shown to buffer against stress and increase job satisfaction. On the other hand, the lowest-rated item is "I believe my manager provides me with constructive feedback," with a mean of 3.19 ($SD = 0.62$), reflecting a moderate influence on stress management. While the employees generally agree with this statement, the moderate rating suggests that there is room for improvement in feedback mechanisms within the organization. Feedback plays a vital role in helping employees understand their performance, identify growth opportunities, and reduce work-related uncertainty (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2019). LGUs could further benefit from fostering regular and constructive feedback practices to enhance employee development and stress resilience.

Table 7 presents the stress management strategies practiced by LGU employees: focus on commitment to the organization, the mean score across all items is 3.30 ($SD = 0.59$), suggesting that commitment to the organization has a very high influence on managing stress among LGU employees. This reflects a strong emotional and professional investment in the organization's goals, culture, and future. When employees are committed to their organization, they are more likely to feel motivated and engaged in their work, which can act as a buffer against stressors. As noted by Meyer and Allen (2019), organizational commitment is crucial for reducing turnover and enhancing performance, particularly in high-stress environments like local government service. The results show that the item with the strongest mean score is "I am committed to the success of this organization," with a mean of 3.42 ($SD = 0.71$), which indicates a very high influence on stress management. This high commitment is associated with employees' strong sense of responsibility toward achieving organizational goals. A committed workforce is less likely to experience burnout or disengagement, as their work is viewed as meaningful and aligned with their personal values. According to Riketta (2018), employees who feel a deep commitment to their organization are more likely to go above and beyond in their roles, which also helps them better manage stress and pressure from their responsibilities. The analysis reveals that the item with the least average rating is "I am confident in the future of this organization," with a mean of 3.21 ($SD = 0.58$), reflecting a moderate influence on stress management. While employees generally agree with this statement, the moderate score indicates that there may be some uncertainty or concerns about the organization's future stability or direction. Lack of confidence in an organization's future can contribute to stress and anxiety, as employees may worry about their job security or the long-term impact of organizational changes (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2019). LGUs should work on reinforcing transparency and providing clear communication about future plans to improve employee confidence and reduce stress.

Table 7
Stress Management Strategies Practiced by LGU Employees: Focus on Commitment to the Organization

Commitment to the Organization	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
I am committed to the success of this organization.	3.42	0.71	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am willing to go the extra mile for this organization.	3.32	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	3.39	0.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I feel a strong sense of loyalty to this organization.	3.37	0.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I plan to stay with this organization for the foreseeable future.	3.24	0.67	Agree	Moderate Influence
I would recommend this organization as a great place to work.	3.26	0.54	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am enthusiastic about my work and my role in the organization.	3.24	0.53	Agree	Moderate Influence
I feel a strong connection to the mission and values of this organization.	3.31	0.56	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
I am confident in the future of this organization.	3.21	0.58	Agree	Moderate Influence
I am actively involved in improving this organization.	3.26	0.54	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence
Average Mean	3.30	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Influence

Legend: 1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree (Very Low Influence), 1.75-2.49 Disagree (Low Influence), 2.50-3.24 Agree (Moderate Influence), 3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree (Very High Influence)

CONCLUSION

This study has provided a comprehensive analysis of the factors contributing to workplace stress and the stress management strategies employed by employees in a local government unit (LGU). The findings reveal that employees in the LGU face various stressors, with workloads being a prominent factor. High demands and long working hours contribute significantly to workplace stress, although other factors such as leadership style, work environment, and health concerns also play essential roles. Leadership style, particularly effective feedback and support from supervisors, and a work environment that fosters collaboration and conflict resolution, were found to have a moderate influence on managing stress. Additionally, health concerns, while moderate, also contribute to stress levels, especially regarding sleep disturbances and mental health.

Moreover, the study highlighted the significant role of stress management strategies in alleviating stress among LGU employees. Employee engagement and commitment to the organization emerged as key strategies, with employees expressing high levels of engagement in their work and strong commitment to the institution's success. These factors are crucial in reducing stress by creating a supportive work environment, promoting personal and professional growth, and enhancing overall job satisfaction. Employees' sense of pride and loyalty to the organization, combined with opportunities for growth, contribute to a reduction in stress levels, helping employees manage their workloads and responsibilities more effectively.

Overall, the study underscores the importance of addressing workplace stress by focusing on workloads, leadership practices, and organizational support structures. It also emphasizes the need for ongoing efforts to improve stress management strategies, particularly through enhancing employee engagement and fostering organizational commitment. By focusing on these areas, LGUs can create healthier work environments that promote the well-being of their employees and enhance overall organizational performance.

Recommendations

For the Faculty. Faculty members should integrate stress management strategies into the curriculum, equipping students with the necessary skills to handle workplace pressures. Offering workshops on time management, mental health, and resilience will help students better prepare for their future roles. Furthermore, faculty should foster an environment that encourages students to discuss stress and its impacts openly. Developing partnerships with mental health professionals for seminars can also contribute to this goal. Lastly, promoting a supportive academic environment will encourage students to prioritize their well-being while managing academic responsibilities.

For the Local Government Employees. Local government employees should actively participate in stress management programs offered by the LGU to enhance their coping mechanisms. They are encouraged to communicate with their supervisors when workloads become overwhelming to avoid burnout. Participating in wellness activities, such as exercise or mindfulness practices, can help employees manage stress. Creating informal support networks with colleagues can provide additional emotional support. Employees should also prioritize self-care and seek professional help if needed to maintain their mental and physical health.

For the Local Government Units. Local Government Units (LGUs) should develop and implement policies aimed at reducing workplace stress and supporting employee well-being. LGUs should establish clear guidelines for managing workloads, ensuring that employees are not overburdened. Investing in leadership development programs to improve the management styles of supervisors can also alleviate stress. Providing access to mental health services and creating awareness about their

availability is crucial for employee support. Regular surveys and feedback mechanisms should be used to assess employee stress levels and continuously improve the work environment.

For the Students. Students, particularly those studying public administration or related fields, should be educated on the importance of stress management in their future careers. They should be encouraged to develop resilience through healthy coping mechanisms and time management techniques. Universities can offer workshops or counseling services to help students deal with academic stress, which will also prepare them for managing workplace stress in the future. Encouraging students to engage in physical activities and mindfulness exercises will help them balance academic pressures. Students should also be made aware of the mental health resources available to them both in academic and professional environments.

For the Future Researchers. Future researchers studying workplace stress and well-being in public sector organizations should continue to explore the relationship between stress management strategies and employee productivity. They should focus on longitudinal studies that assess the long-term effects of stress management programs on employee health and performance. Investigating the role of leadership styles and organizational culture in influencing stress levels will offer valuable insights. Additionally, exploring how various demographic factors, such as age, gender, and education, impact stress experiences will deepen the understanding of workplace stress. Finally, researchers should assess the effectiveness of different stress management techniques to determine best practices in the workplace.

REFERENCES

- Al-Zoubi, Z., AlKaabi, A., Qablan, A., Bataineh, O., & Issa, H. B. (2024). The impact of work pressure on decision-making effectiveness among department heads in faculties of educational sciences. *PLoS ONE*, 19(8), e0304584. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0304584>
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2019). The role of feedback in job satisfaction: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 72(4), 435–473. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12283>
- Day, A. L., & Randell, K. D. (2018). Building a foundation for psychologically healthy workplaces and well-being. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research*, 23(4), e12125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jabr.12125>
- Giorgi, G., Lecca, L. I., Alessio, F., Finstad, G. L., Bondanini, G., Lulli, L. G., ... & Mucci, N. (2020). COVID-19-related mental health effects in the workplace: A narrative review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(21), 7857. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17217857>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2020). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(10), 1143–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000437>
- Huang, Y., Xu, S., Hua, J., Zhu, D., Liu, X., Hu, D., & Zhang, J. (2019). Association between job stress and burnout among healthcare workers: A cross-sectional study in a tertiary hospital in China. *BMJ Open*, 9(12), e032836. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-032836>
- Jadidi, A., Irannejad, B., Safarabadi, M., & Zand, S. (2024). Evaluation of stress management effectiveness using the action research approach on the job stress of pre-hospital emergency staff. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, 100702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2024.100702>

- Jena, R. K., & Pradhan, R. K. (2018). Work engagement and employee well-being: A cross-national study of Indian and Australian employees. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-02-2016-0038>
- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2021). Empowering leadership: Leading people to be present through affective organizational commitment? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(5), 1073–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1511615>
- Li, X. (2023). Literature Review on Employee Motivation. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 10(1), 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ijeh.v10i1.11106>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2018). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial Relations Research Association (IRRA) Proceedings*, 70(1), 2-12.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2018). A meta-analysis of the relationships of age and tenure with innovation-related behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(4), 1011–1036. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12221>
- Nguyen, T. M., Mia, L., Winata, L., & Chong, V. K. (2020). Effect of transformational-leadership style and management control system on managerial performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.046>
- Park, S., & Kim, J. (2020). The impact of communication and job stress on organizational commitment among public employees in Korea. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 4945. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124945>
- Plessen, C. Y., Franken, F. R., Ster, C., Schmid, R. R., Wolfmayr, C., Mayer, A., Sobisch, M., Kathofer, M., Rattner, K., Kotlyar, E., Maierwieser, R. J., & Tran, U. S. (2020). Humor styles and personality: A systematic review and meta-analysis on the relations between humor styles and the Big Five personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 154, 109676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109676>
- Raza, H., Ali, M., Naseem, K., Moeed, A., Ahmed, T., & Ahmed, R. (2020). Impact of salary and job security on job satisfaction of teachers in public and private sector universities. *Global Social Sciences Review*, V(I), 232–239. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2020\(V-I\).25](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2020(V-I).25)
- Rehman, S. U., Bhatti, A., Chaudhry, N. I., & Ahmad, M. (2019). Impact of work-life balance, job satisfaction, and job stress on employee performance: Evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 13(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.361920065>
- Rincón, D., & Barrientos, A. (2018). Gender equality in public administration: Progress and challenges in the era of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)*. <https://www.undp.org/publications/genderequality-public-administration>
- Skakon, J., Nielsen, K., Borg, V., & Guzman, J. (2018). Are leaders' well-being, behaviours, and style associated with the affective well-being of their employees? A systematic review of three decades of research. *Work & Stress*, 32(2), 107–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1303755>
- Van der Feltz-Cornelis, C. M., Varley, D., Allgar, V. L., & De Beurs, D. (2020). Workplace stress, presenteeism, absenteeism, and resilience among university staff: A survey in four European countries. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 93(2), 273–288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-019-01410-6>

- View of Exploring the Link between Training and Development, Employee Engagement, and Employee Retention. (n.d.). <https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jbms/article/view/4865/4132>
- View of THE INFLUENCE OF HUMAN RESOURCE QUALITY AND WORK MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF NORTH SUMATRA PROVINCE. (n.d.). <https://journal.uitm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/JIPSF/article/view/3088/1433>
- Younas, S., & Khanum, S. (2024). Examining the Role of Stress and Team Support in Decision Making under Uncertainty and Time Pressure. *MDM Policy & Practice*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/23814683241273575>
- Zhou, Y., Yang, Y., Qiu, X., Yang, X., Pan, H., Ban, B., & Wang, W. (2021). Long working hours and depressive symptoms among employees: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(8), 4237. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084237>