

Fundamental Functions as Predictors of Job Stress and Teaching Performance

¹Shiela Amor C. Monsanto

¹Bukidnon State University, Philippines

Received 5th April 2025; Accepted 28th April 2025; Published Online 29th May 2025

DOI: 10.63941/DIT.ADSimrj.2025.1.2.07

ABSTRACT

Teachers play a significant role in influencing student educational experiences as well as the objectives and reputation of academic institutions. Their responsibilities go beyond the classroom and include a range of tasks that help people become more knowledgeable, talented, and responsible. This study explored the fundamental functions as predictors of job stress and teaching performance among faculty members of the main and satellite campuses. The study employed the descriptive correlation design and was conducted during the school year 2022-2023, employing questionnaires and interviews. The findings revealed that the majority of the faculty are females, aged 32-40 years old, with Instructor 1 positions, mostly designated as coordinators, and have rendered 1-3 years of service. The statistical data revealed that the faculty *often* performed well in *teaching* and *administrative roles* and *sometimes* performed moderately in *research*. Faculty with fundamental functions showed that their workload, time pressure, declining health, and burnt-out symptoms *sometimes* caused *job stress*. The *teaching performance* confirmed that the faculty members were *outstanding* in lesson preparation, management of learning, innovativeness, creativity, mastery of the subject matter, and assessment of learning. Findings further disclosed that there is a significant negative correlation between fundamental functions and *job stress*; fundamental functions *significantly predict* job stress; and the relationship between *job stress* and *teaching performance* did not exhibit a significant relationship. Consequently, policy notes were drawn from the study. In conclusion, this study suggests that fundamental functions are significant predictors of job stress and teaching performance.

Keywords: administrative, fundamental functions, job stress, teaching performance, research

INTRODUCTION

Teachers play a significant role in influencing student educational experiences as well as the objectives and reputation of academic institutions. Their responsibilities go beyond the classroom and include a range of tasks that help people become more knowledgeable, talented, and responsible. They also handle numerous responsibilities or positions, reflecting their diverse roles in the academic community. This scenario has led to a growing need for understanding how faculty members' different responsibilities and job stress affect their teaching ability (Tolentino, 2023; Taggart, 2021). In addition, teachers are often given important administrative roles on top of their teaching duties, which include course scheduling, curriculum preparation, and academic resource management. In the case of teachers in a state university in Bukidnon, they often take on additional responsibilities and tasks beyond their regular duties as specified in Memorandum No.197, Series of 2021, Faculty Designations for CY 2022, with corresponding equivalent teaching load and Memorandum No. 014, Series of 2022, Designations in the Satellite Campuses. Balancing these additional roles with their primary teaching responsibilities can be a formidable challenge for faculty members (Dayagbil et al., 2021). However, having too many obligations and roles that contradict one another can result in role conflict, when duties related to one function may conflict with those related to teaching. This may affect their capacity to provide excellent instruction and cater to the various demands of the students (Fathi et al., 2021). A study by Suleman et al. (2020) found the intricate connections between faculty roles, stress levels, and teaching effectiveness within the realm of higher education. Hence, this research explored the interrelationships

between faculty members' fundamental functions, job stress, and teaching performance to provide a thorough picture of the issues educators faced in higher education. It aimed to assess the faculty's fundamental functions as predictors of job stress and teaching performance in a state university in Bukidnon.

METHODOLOGY

This quantitative study adopted a correlational research design, specifically employing a structured approach to explore the significant relationships between faculty members' fundamental functions, job stress, and teaching performance in higher education institutions. The population included 265 full-time regular faculty members, each holding specific official designations and having rendered at least one year of service during the academic year 2022-2023. The research instruments employed in this quantitative study were divided into several sections adopted from different authors. The first part asked for the demographic profile of the respondents. The second part, which was adapted from Leiter's Burnout Model (Leiter, 1993) and Leiter Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1986), included items related to workload, time pressure, declining health, and burnout symptoms, and was modified to fit the context of the study. The third part is a structured questionnaire that assessed the roles and functions of faculty with fundamental functions, including teaching roles, administrative roles, and research activities. The fourth part was on the teaching performance, which was adopted from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and included items related to lesson preparation, management of learning, innovativeness, creativity, mastery of the subjects, and assessment of learning. Finally, the last part included key informant interview questions to draw qualitative answers from the respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section covers the study's findings, including analysis and interpretation. It focuses on the fundamental functions as predictors of job stress and teaching performance.

Profile of the Respondents

The data revealed that those 31 to 40 years old have 41.4 percent, which obtained the highest frequency, followed by those 41 years old and above with 29.9 percent. However, those 21 to 30 years old have 28.7 percent, which is the lowest frequency. This means that the majority of the faculty members belong to the age group of 31 to 40 years old. When it comes to sex, the majority of the respondents are female, accounting for 105 teachers or 66.88 percent of the study's population, while there are 52 male teachers or 33.12 percent of respondents. In terms of rank, the data revealed that the rank of Instructor has 65.61 percent, which obtained the highest frequency, followed by Associate Professor with 18.47 percent. On the other hand, the rank of Professor has obtained 2.54 percent, which is the lowest frequency. This means that the majority of the faculty members with fundamental functions are ranked as Instructors. In terms of official designations, the data revealed that the position/designation as Coordinator made up 38.85 percent, which obtained the highest frequency, followed by the Department Heads and Program Chair with 14.01 percent. However, the Faculty Regent and Office Director obtained 0.64 percent, which is the lowest frequency. This means that most of the faculty members are designated as coordinators. The overall statistics display a variety of representations of institutional roles among the respondents. Additionally, the majority (42.04%) of the respondents have only one official designation which obtained the highest frequency, followed by the two designations with 29.94 percent. On the contrary, respondents with three or more designations have 28.02 percent, which obtained the lowest frequency. This means that the majority of the faculty members have only

one official designation on their campus as designated by the university president. The respondents answered one designation only, as it was indicated in the survey questionnaire that only official designations should be included. However, on top of this, there are other designations given by their immediate supervisors. Finally, the data revealed that the majority of the teachers have been in the service for 1 to 3 years (41.40%), while those who have been in the service for 7 to 9 years (12.74%) ranked the lowest frequency.

Respondents' Level of Fundamental Roles and Functions

Table 1 reflects the overall results of the respondents' assessment of their fundamental roles and functions in terms of teaching, administration, and research.

Table 1
Summary of the Mean Distribution on the Assessment of Fundamental Functions of Faculty Members

Fundamental Functions	Overall Mean	SD	Interpretation
Teaching	3.88	0.81	Well performed
Administrative	3.69	0.78	Well performed
Research	2.90	1.04	Moderately performed
Grand Mean	3.49	0.88	Well performed

Legend: 1.00 – 1.80 (Never); 1.81 – 2.60 (Rarely); 2.61 – 3.40 (Sometimes); 3.41 – 4.20 (Often); 4.21 – 5.00 (Always)

The data indicate that faculty members generally perceive themselves as performing well in their fundamental roles, with an overall mean score of 3.49, suggesting that these responsibilities are often well-performed. Notably, teaching responsibilities stand out with the highest mean score of 3.88, highlighting that faculty members excel in their instructional duties. Similarly, administrative responsibilities are also viewed positively, with a mean score of 3.69, indicating effective performance in administrative tasks. These findings imply that faculty members are confident in their ability to fulfill their primary duties, which could contribute to a positive educational environment and efficient administrative operations. Emphasizing and supporting these well-performed areas can enhance overall institutional effectiveness and faculty satisfaction. The results support the claim of Rasanen et al. (2020) that the roles of teachers encompass a variety of responsibilities central to the educational process. This includes designing and delivering curriculum, assessing student performance, and fostering a supportive learning environment. Additionally, Prasad et al. (2020) claimed that tasks such as record-keeping, organizing school events, and communicating with parents and colleagues to ensure smooth educational operations are among the additional functions of teachers. On the other hand, Huenneke et al. (2017) asserted that faculty research performance impacts academic outcomes. They found that faculty members who actively engage in research activities contribute significantly to the knowledge and reputation of their institutions.

Respondents' Level of Job Stress

Table 2 shows the statistical results of the respondents' assessment of their job stress in terms of workload, time pressure, declining health, and burnout symptoms.

Table 2
The Summary of Job Stress Experience of Faculty with Fundamental Functions

Job Stress	Mean	Std. Deviation	Description	Interpretation
Workload	3.03	1.01	Sometimes	Moderate
Time Pressure	3.21	0.98	Sometimes	Moderate
Declining Health	3.03	1.11	Sometimes	Moderate
Burnout Symptoms	2.97	1.06	Sometimes	Moderate
Grand Mean	3.06	1.04	Sometimes	Moderate

Legend: 1.00 – 1.80 (Never) 1.81 – 2.60 (Rarely) 2.61 – 3.40 (Sometimes) 3.41 – 4.20 (Often) 4.21 – 5.00 (Always)

The summary of job stress experienced by faculty members across various fundamental functions reveals a grand mean of 3.06 (SD=1.04), indicating a moderate level of stress that faculty members sometimes experience. The specific stress factors, including workload (mean=3.03, SD=1.01), time pressure (mean=3.21, SD=0.98), declining health (mean=3.03, SD=1.11), and burnout symptoms (mean=2.97, SD=1.06), all fall within the "sometimes" range, reflecting a consistent moderate stress level across different dimensions. This suggests that while stress is not overwhelming, it is a recurring issue that can impact faculty well-being and performance. Addressing these stress factors through supportive measures, such as time management training, health initiatives, and workload adjustments, could enhance faculty job satisfaction and overall effectiveness. The result affirmed the claim of Xu and Wang (2023) that teachers in universities often experience burnout due to the high demands of their multifaceted roles, which include teaching, research, and administrative tasks. The pressure to meet academic standards, publish research, and manage large class sizes can lead to excessive workload and time constraints. Zhang et al. (2024) and Aboramadan (2020) both emphasized that burnout negatively affects teaching performance, leading to decreased effectiveness, lower job satisfaction, and higher turnover intentions among faculty. Consequently, job stress and burnout symptoms in faculty members can adversely impact their teaching performance and overall well-being. Similarly, Sanchez-Gomez and Bresó (2020) found a strong link between job stress and burnout symptoms in faculty members, noting that high job stress levels can lead to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

Respondents' Level of Teaching Performance

Table 3 shows the statistical results of the respondents' assessment of their teaching performance in terms of lesson preparation, management of learning, innovativeness and creativity, mastery of the subject matter, and assessment of learning.

The summary table of teaching performance indicates that faculty members excel in their teaching roles, with an overall grand mean of 4.38 (SD=0.53), interpreted as "outstanding" and "very well performed." Each specific aspect of teaching—lesson preparation (mean=4.48, SD=0.55), management of learning (mean=4.54, SD=0.55), innovativeness and creativity (mean=4.23, SD=0.50), mastery of the subject matter (mean=4.23, SD=0.50), and assessment of learning (mean=4.43,

SD=0.56)—also received outstanding ratings. These results suggest that faculty members are highly effective in preparing lessons, managing the learning environment, applying creativity, demonstrating subject matter expertise, and assessing student learning. The implication is that the university's faculty are performing their teaching responsibilities at an exemplary level, which likely contributes to high-quality education and positive student outcomes. The result affirmed the findings of Soto-Rubio et al. (2020) that faculty members excelled in creating a secure and conducive learning environment, clearly communicating high expectations for student behavior, and fostering a positive learning climate. They effectively planned activities to ensure students understood learning objectives, methods, and grading criteria. Additionally, Li and Yang (2023) claimed that faculty members efficiently utilized ICTs and demonstrated strong knowledge of their course or subject matter.

Table 3
Summary Table of Teaching Performance

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Description	Interpretation
Lesson Preparation	4.48	0.55	Outstanding	Very Well Performed
Management of Learning	4.54	0.55	Outstanding	Very Well Performed
Innovativeness and Creativity	4.23	0.50	Outstanding	Very Well Performed
Mastery of the Subject Matter	4.23	0.50	Outstanding	Very Well Performed
Assessment of Learning	4.43	0.56	Outstanding	Very Well Performed
Grand Mean	4.38	0.53	Outstanding	Very Well Performed

Legend: 1.00 – 1.80 (Very Poor) 1.81 – 2.60 (Unsatisfactory) 2.61 – 3.40 (Satisfactory) 3.41 – 4.20 (Very Satisfactory) 4.21 – 5.00 (Outstanding)

Additionally, Gayon and Tan (2021) found that HEI faculty use alternative forms of assessment in teaching that can improve teaching performance by emphasizing both the learning process and outcomes, motivating students, and offering fresh approaches to exploring subjects. These assessments can enrich the teaching and learning experience by providing a more comprehensive and authentic evaluation of student performance.

Significant Difference in Job Stress when Faculty are Grouped According to Profile Characteristics

Table 4 shows the results of the regression analysis when the respondents are grouped according to sex.

In terms of sex, the data revealed that sex (t-value = 1.708, p-value = .090) exhibits a statistically significant difference in the faculty's job stress. This means that the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference in their job stress when respondents are grouped according to profile characteristics, is rejected since the p-value is less than the level 0.05.

Table 4

Test of Difference in the Respondents' Job Stress and Profile Characteristics based on Sex

Job Stress	Sex		t-value	p	Remarks
	Male (n=52)	Female (n=105)			
Workload	3.15±.724	2.98±0.877	28.6	<.001	Significant
Pressure	3.27±.843	3.15±0.875	18.9	<.001	Significant
Health	3.04±1.028	2.96±0.831	16.0	<.001	Significant
Burnout	3.08±.882	2.93±0.775	16.9	<.001	Significant
Total Measure	3.21±.723	3.00±0.734	19.0	<.001	Significant

Significant if $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

Table 5

Test of Difference in the Respondents' Job Stress and Profile Characteristics based on Age

Job Stress	Age			F-value	p	Remarks
	21-30 (n=45)	31-40 (n=65)	41 and up (n=47)			
Workload	2.87±0.842	3.18±0.682	3.00±0.978	2.33	0.103	Not Significant
Pressure	3.11±0.859	3.32±0.812	3.09±0.929	1.34	0.267	Not Significant
Health	2.80±0.919	3.08±0.835	3.04±0.955	1.37	0.258	Not Significant
Burnout	2.76±0.743	3.12±0.801	3.00±0.860	3.07	0.051	Not Significant
Total Measure	2.96±0.767	3.20±0.666	3.00±0.780	1.87	0.159	Not Significant

Significant if $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

Table 6

Test of Difference in the Respondents' Job Stress and Profile Characteristics based on Rank

Job Stress	Rank				F-value	p	Remarks
	Instructor (n=103)	Assistant professor (n=21)	Associate Professor (n=29)	Professor (n=4)			
Workload	3.05±0.845	3.29±0.784	2.86±0.743	2.75±1.258	1.194	0.351	Not Significant
Pressure	3.13±0.788	3.76±0.831	3.07±0.961	2.75±1.258	3.488	0.048	Significant
Health	3.00±0.950	3.00±0.775	2.90±0.860	3.25±0.500	0.434	0.732	Not Significant
Burnout	2.98±0.863	3.10±0.625	2.83±0.711	3.5±1.000	0.948	0.446	Not Significant
Total Measure	3.06±0.777	3.38±0.590	2.90±0.618	3.00±0.816	2.468	0.107	Not Significant

Significant if $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

Meanwhile, the test of differences in respondents' job stress and profile characteristics based on age revealed non-significant findings across various stress indicators. While there were slight variations in

reported stress levels across different age groups, with younger respondents tending to report slightly lower stress levels compared to older counterparts, these differences did not reach statistical significance. Specifically, workload, pressure, health-related stress, burnout, and the total measure of stress did not significantly differ based on age groups.

The test of difference in respondents' job stress based on rank revealed significant differences in perceived pressure levels among different ranks, with assistant professors reporting significantly higher pressure compared to instructors, associate professors, and professors. However, workload, health-related stress, burnout, and the total measure of stress did not significantly differ based on rank. These findings suggest that while pressure may vary among different ranks, other aspects of job stress appear consistent across faculty ranks.

Table 7
Test of Difference in the Respondents' Job Stress and Profile Characteristics based on Designation

Job Stress	Designations										F-value	p	Remarks
	Campus Head	Faculty Regent	Office Director	Project Head	Dean	Dept. Head	Program Chair	Coordinator	Dept.-level Committee Chair	Dept.-level Committee Member			
	(n=12)	(n=1)	(n=1)	(n=4)	(n=6)	(n=22)	(n=22)	(n=61)	(n=13)	(n=15)			
Workload	3.33±0.888	3±.	3±.	3.25±0.957	2.5±1.049	2.91±0.75	2.82±0.588	2.98±0.764	3.46±1.198	3.33±0.9	0.91	1.35	Not Significant
Pressure	3.17±1.03	5±.	3±.	3.5±0.577	3±1.414	3.09±0.868	2.95±0.653	3.16±0.778	3.69±0.947	3.27±0.961	0.97	1.33	Not Significant
Health	12±3.17	3±.	3±.	2.75±0.5	3.33±1.033	2.68±0.646	3±0.69	2.93±0.91	3.38±1.121	3.07±1.033	0.63	0.78	Not Significant
Burnout	12±3.25	3±.	3±.	3.5±1.291	3±0.632	2.82±0.733	3±0.756	2.87±0.785	3.23±1.013	3.07±0.704	0.47	0.70	Not Significant
Total Measure	12±3.33	4±.	3±.	3.5±0.577	2.83±0.753	2.82±0.588	3±0.436	3±0.73	3.46±1.05	3.2±0.775	0.76	1.44	Not Significant

Significant if p -value < 0.05

Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant

H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

The test of difference in respondents' job stress based on designation revealed non-significant differences across various stress indicators. While there were some variations in reported stress levels among different designations, including workload, pressure, health-related stress, burnout, and the total measure of stress, these differences did not reach statistical significance.

Table 8
Test of Difference in the Respondents' Job Stress and Profile Characteristics based on the Number of Designations

Job Stress	No. of Designations			F-value	p	Remarks
	1 (n=66)	2 (n=47)	3 above (n=44)			
Workload	2.91±0.907	2.98±0.794	3.30±0.701	3.60	0.03	Significant
Pressure	3.32±0.914	3.02±0.821	3.18±0.815	1.62	0.20	Not Significant
Health	2.86±0.892	3.00±1.000	3.16±0.776	1.68	0.19	Not Significant
Burnout	3.02±0.734	2.83±0.868	3.09±0.858	1.13	0.33	Not Significant
Total Measure	3.08±0.751	2.94±0.734	3.20±0.701	1.58	0.21	Not Significant

Significant if p -value < 0.05

Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant

H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

The test of difference in respondents' job stress based on the number of designations revealed significant differences in reported workload levels among individuals with one, two, and three or more

designations. However, pressure, health-related stress, burnout, and the total measure of stress did not significantly differ based on the number of designations.

Table 9
Test of Difference in the Respondents' Job Stress and Profile Characteristics based on Years of Service

Job Stress	Years in Service				F-value	p	Remarks
	1-3 years (n=103)	4-6 years (n=21)	7-9 years (n=29)	10 yrs above (n=4)			
Workload	2.92±0.797	3.28±0.882	2.9±0.553	3.03±0.944	1.83	0.15	Not Significant
Pressure	3.18±0.788	3.21±0.914	3.15±0.875	3.21±0.978	0.02	1.00	Not Significant
Health	2.95±0.926	3.07±0.985	3.05±0.686	2.90±0.860	0.29	0.84	Not Significant
Burnout	2.88±0.781	3.19±0.958	2.85±0.587	3.00±0.756	1.27	0.29	Not Significant
Total Measure	2.97±0.790	3.28±0.734	3.10±0.553	2.97±0.680	1.72	0.17	Not Significant

Significant if $p\text{-value} < 0.05$

Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant

H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

Finally, the test of difference in respondents' job stress based on years of service did not yield significant differences across various stress indicators. While there were slight variations in reported stress levels among different tenure groups, including workload, pressure, health-related stress, burnout, and the total measure of stress, none of these differences reached statistical significance.

Relationship Between Fundamental Functions and Job Stress of Faculty Members

Table 10 depicts the significant relationship between fundamental functions and the job stress of faculty members. The data exposed that Teaching Role ($r=-.275$, $p\text{-value}=.000$), Administrative Role ($r=-.242$, $p\text{-value}=.002$), and Research Role ($r=-.199$, $p\text{-value}=.013$) exhibit a significant relationship with faculty members' job stress since the $p\text{-values}$ are lesser than 0.05.

Table 10
Test of the Relationship between Faculty Fundamental Functions and Job Stress

Fundamental Functions	Job Stress														
	Workload			Time Pressure			Declining Health			Burnout Symptoms			Job Stress		
	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks
Teaching	-.228**	.004	Reject	-.138	.085	Failed to reject	-.191*	.017	Reject	-.190*	.017	Reject	-.275**	.000	Reject
Administrative	-.227**	.004	Reject	-.180*	.024	Reject	-.148	.065	Failed to reject	-.200*	.012	Reject	-.242**	.002	Reject
Research	-.224**	.005	Reject	-.306**	.000	Reject	-.156	.051	Failed to reject	-.189*	.018	Reject	-.199*	.013	Reject
Fundamental Functions	-.252**	.001	Reject	-.272**	.001	Reject	-.176*	.027	Reject	-.237**	.003	Reject	-.280**	.000	Reject

Significant if $p\text{-value} < 0.05$

Legend: H_0 is rejected if Significant H_0 is failed to reject if Not Significant

The data provides a widespread relationship between faculty members with more than one obligation and their job stress throughout diverse roles consisting of teaching, administrative responsibilities, and research. This finding corroborates the present study, which indicates that fundamental functions heightened strain stages among faculty members. Lin and Huang (2020) explored the impact of workload distribution on school activity pressure and observed that faculty members who are stressed

with more than one responsibility experienced multiple levels of pressure, especially in domains such as teaching, administrative duties, and research. This indicates that the demands related to juggling various responsibilities within instructional settings can cause large strain on faculty members, leading to increased stress levels and capacity detrimental to their well-being and process pride. Moreover, Udayar et al. (2020) investigated the connection between faculty members' process pressure and their perceived workload across unique expert roles. Their findings discovered that faculty members who perceive their workload as overwhelming due to fundamental functions are more likely to experience heightened process pressure stages. This underscores the importance of thinking about the multifaceted nature of faculty roles and duties while addressing process stress within instructional establishments.

Significant Relationship Between Faculty Fundamental Functions and Teaching Performance

Table 11 shows the result of the correlation analysis of the relationship between fundamental functions and teaching performance, which depicts the significant relationship between fundamental functions and the teaching performance of faculty members. The data exposed that Teaching Role ($r=-.66$, $p\text{-value}=.410$), Administrative Role ($r=-.73$, $p\text{-value}=.365$), and Research Role ($r=.108$, $p\text{-value}=.179$) do not exhibit a significant relationship with faculty members' teaching performance since the p -values are greater than 0.05.

Table 11
Test of the Relationship between Faculty Fundamental Functions and Teaching Performance

Fundamental Functions	Teaching Performance																	
	Lesson Preparation			Management of Learning			Innovativeness and Creativity			Mastery of the Subject Matter			Assessment of Learning			Teaching Performance		
	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks	r	p-value	Remarks
Teaching	-.025	.755	Failed to reject	-.027	.734	Failed to reject	-.076	.343	Failed to reject	-.150	.061	Failed to reject	-.094	.241	Failed to reject	-.066	.410	Failed to reject
Administrative	-.133	.096	Failed to reject	.119	.136	Failed to reject	.071	.375	Failed to reject	.068	.397	Failed to reject	-.076	.342	Failed to reject	-.073	.365	Failed to reject
Research	.025	.752	Failed to reject	.139	.083	Failed to reject	.108	.178	Failed to reject	.197*	.014	Failed to reject	.025	.758	Failed to reject	.108	.179	Failed to reject
Fundamental Functions	-.081	.313	Failed to reject	.109	.175	Failed to reject	.109	.175	Failed to reject	.067	.404	Failed to reject	.018	.825	Failed to reject	-.008	.922	Failed to reject

Significant if $p\text{-value} < 0.05$

Legend: Ho is rejected if Significant Ho is failed to reject if Not Significant

The findings suggest that there is no significant relationship between faculty members juggling fundamental functions and their performance across various roles such as teaching, administrative responsibilities, and research. Karaköse et al. (2021) revealed how workload influences the teaching performance of faculty members. Their findings suggested that while the distribution of workload may differ among various roles within educational institutions, it does not necessarily hinder teaching effectiveness. It further supports the claim of Udayar et al. (2020) on the relationship between school workload and teaching performance in specific professional roles. They claimed that no matter the demands associated with fundamental functions, faculty members can maintain the best range of teaching performance. This suggests that faculty members may have developed strategies to balance their responsibilities effectively and leverage the synergies between different tasks to enhance their teaching performance (Reymert & Thune, 2023).

Fundamental Functions as a Predictor of Job Stress

Table 12 shows the statistical results of the regression analysis conducted to determine if fundamental functions significantly predict job stress.

Table 12
Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Job Stress by Fundamental Functions

Predictors Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	4.191	.314		13.353(.000)	Significant
Fundamental Functions Overall Measure	-.318	.088	-.280	-3.631(.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted $R^2 = .072$
Significant ($p < .05$)

ANOVA for Regression: $F = 13.186$, $p = .000$.
Not significant ($p > .05$)

Fitted Regression Model: Job Stress = 4.191 + -.318 (Fundamental Functions)

Predictors Model 2	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	4.597	.365		12.596(.000)	Significant
X ₁ : Teaching	-.219	.090	-.215	-2.447(.016)	Significant
X ₂ : Administrative	-.093	.097	-.088	-.952(.343)	Not Significant
X ₃ : Research	-.110	.062	-.143	-1.762(.080)	Not Significant

Note: Adjusted $R^2 = .091$
Significant ($p < .05$)

ANOVA for Regression: $F = 6.227$, $p = .001$.
Not significant ($p > .05$)

Fitted Regression Model: Job Stress = 4.597 + -.219 (Teaching)

The results in Model 1 revealed a statistically significant overall model (ANOVA $F = 13.186$, $p = .000$), indicating that fundamental functions do predict the variance in job stress among respondents. The adjusted R^2 value of .072 or 7.2% supports the explanatory power of the model. Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 2 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 4.191 + -0.318 X_1$$

where:

$\hat{Y}$ = Job Stress

X_1 = Fundamental Functions

This means that the various responsibilities that faculty members have to handle play a significant role in their job stress levels. Furthermore, Model 2 indicated a statistically significant model (ANOVA $F = 6.227$, $p = .001$), suggesting that variables under fundamental functions in terms of Teaching do significantly contribute to explaining the variance in job stress among respondents. The adjusted R^2 value of .091 or 9.1% indicates a provision for the descriptive influence of the model. Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 1 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 4.597 + -0.219 X_1$$

where:

$\hat{Y}$ = Job Stress

X_1 = Teaching

This implies that the various teaching responsibilities that faculty members have to handle play a significant role in their job stress levels. Prior research has indicated that stress arises from role overload, role insufficiency, social support, monthly income, and role limitations. Role overload, in particular, significantly contributes to stress among teachers (Manalo, 2020). When teachers are burdened with excessive responsibilities, they often struggle to manage their time and energy effectively. The demand to fulfill multiple roles, such as teaching, grading, mentoring, and participating in extracurricular activities, can become overwhelming. This overload not only affects their professional duties but also encroaches on their time, leading to a poor work-life balance. Consequently, Tolentino (2023) added that teachers may experience fatigue, anxiety, and a diminished sense of accomplishment, which can adversely impact their mental health and overall well-being. Additionally, Tarraya (2023) expounded that the pressure to meet high performance standards and the expectation to cater to the diverse needs of students further exacerbate the stress caused by role overload.

Fundamental Functions as a Predictor of Teaching Performance

Table 13 shows the statistical results of the regression analysis conducted to determine if fundamental functions significantly predict teaching performance.

Table 13

Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Teaching Performance by Fundamental Functions

Predictors Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	4.563	.222		20.513(.000)	Significant
Fundamental Functions Overall Measure	-.006	.062	-.008	-.098(.922)	Not Significant

Note: Adjusted $R^2 = -.006$
Significant ($p < .05$)

ANOVA for Regression: $F = .010$, $p = .922$.
Not significant ($p > .05$)

Predictors Model 2	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	4.684	.260		18.047(.000)	Significant
X ₁ : Teaching	-.021	.064	-.031	-.335(.738)	Not Significant
X ₂ : Administrative	-.077	.069	-.108	-1.114(.267)	Not Significant
X ₃ : Research	.077	.044	.148	1.743(.083)	Not Significant

Note: Adjusted $R^2 = .007$
Significant ($p < .05$)

ANOVA for Regression: $F = 1.354$, $p = .259$.
Not significant ($p > .05$)

In Model 1, the overall measure of fundamental functions does not significantly predict teaching performance. The ANOVA results indicate a non-significant model with $F = 0.010$ and $p = 0.922$, suggesting that the fundamental functions measure does not contribute to explaining the variance in teaching performance among respondents. Specifically, the unstandardized coefficient for the fundamental functions overall measure is -0.006 with a t-value of -0.098, indicating an extremely weak and non-significant relationship ($p = 0.922$). This implies that changes in the fundamental functions overall measure do not significantly impact teaching performance, highlighting that other factors might be more influential in determining teaching effectiveness.

In Model 2, the analysis includes three specific predictors: Teaching, Administrative, and Research activities. Similar to Model 1, the model is non-significant with ANOVA results showing $F = 1.354$ and $p = 0.259$. None of the individual predictors in Model 2 show a significant relationship with teaching performance. The unstandardized coefficients for Teaching, Administrative, and Research activities are -0.021 ($p = 0.738$), -0.077 ($p = 0.267$), and 0.077 ($p = 0.083$), respectively. The t-values also reflect non-significant relationships, with Teaching at -0.335 , Administrative at -1.114 , and Research at 1.743 . Although the Research variable has a slightly higher t-value and lower p-value compared to the other predictors, it still does not reach significance ($p = 0.083$).

Job Stress as a Predictor of Teaching Performance

Table 14 shows the statistical results of the regression analysis conducted to determine if job stress significantly predicts teaching performance.

Table 14
Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Teaching Performance by Job Stress

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
Model 1	B	S.E.	β		
(Constant)	4.321	0.171		25.20(.000)	
Job Stress Overall Measure	0.071	0.054	0.105	1.32(.189)	Not Significant
Note: Adjusted $R^2 = .004$ Significant ($p < .05$) ANOVA for Regression: $F = 1.74$, $p = .189$. Not significant ($p > .05$)					
Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
Model 2	B	S.E.	β		
(Constant)	4.232	0.255		16.564(.000)	
X ₁ : Workload	0.108	0.101	0.114	1.068(.287)	Not Significant
X ₂ : Pressure	0.045	0.060	0.078	0.752(.453)	Not Significant
X ₃ : Health	-0.023	0.062	-0.042	-0.384(.702)	Not Significant
X ₄ : Burnout	-0.041	0.069	-0.067	-0.596(.552)	Not Significant
Note: Adjusted $R^2 = -.009$ Significant ($p < .05$) ANOVA for Regression: $F = .639$, $p = .635$. Not significant ($p > .05$)					

In Model 1, where the overall measure of job stress is considered, the results indicate a non-significant relationship with teaching performance. The ANOVA results reveal an F-value of 1.74 with a corresponding p-value of 0.189, suggesting that the overall measure of job stress does not significantly contribute to explaining the variance in teaching performance among respondents. Specifically, the unstandardized coefficient for the job stress overall measure is 0.071 with a t-value of 1.32, indicating a weak and non-significant relationship ($p = 0.189$). This implies that changes in the overall measure of job stress do not significantly affect teaching performance, indicating that other factors may be more influential in determining teaching effectiveness.

In Model 2, the analysis delves deeper into specific aspects of job stress, including workload, pressure, health concerns, and burnout. However, similar to Model 1, none of these specific predictors

demonstrate a significant relationship with teaching performance. The ANOVA results for Model 2 also show a non-significant model, with an F-value of 0.639 and a p-value of 0.635. None of the individual predictors, including workload, pressure, health, and burnout, exhibit significant relationships with teaching performance. The unstandardized coefficients and t-values for these predictors further confirm the lack of significance, with all p-values exceeding 0.05. Uwizeye et al. (2022) asserted that the fundamental functions of a faculty, such as curriculum development, policy implementation, and administrative tasks, do not significantly predict teaching performance because they are more organizational and procedural rather than directly tied to the day-to-day interactions between teachers and students. Yosiana et al. (2020) explained that while these functions are essential for the smooth operation of an educational institution, they do not inherently impact the individual teacher's ability to engage students, deliver effective instruction, or adapt to classroom dynamics. Teaching performance is more influenced by factors such as a teacher's pedagogical skills, classroom management, and personal well-being, rather than the broader administrative and structural functions of the faculty.

Proposed Policy Notes to Help Teachers in Their Functions

Title: Policy on Workload Equity, Transparency, and Faculty Well-being

Executive Summary: This policy framework is designed to enhance workload equity, transparency, and overall well-being for faculty members across the main and satellite campuses of Bukidnon State University. It aims to systematically address the distribution of teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities, ensuring fairness and transparency. By instituting regular workload monitoring and creating mechanisms for faculty to view anonymized workload comparisons, the policy promotes a culture of equity. In addition to workload management, this policy emphasizes targeted support and professional development. Workshops on stress management, efficient time use, and effective delegation will be offered each semester to help faculty manage their responsibilities better. Enhanced mentorship programs will pair experienced faculty with those new to the institution or with fundamental roles.

Content or Scope of the Problem: Faculty members face significant disparities in workload distribution. Teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities are often unevenly allocated, leading to some faculty members being overburdened while others have a lighter load. The lack of a transparent system for workload monitoring exacerbates this issue, creating confusion and potential dissatisfaction among faculty. There is a pressing need for a system that quantifies responsibilities and allows faculty to compare workloads within their departments to ensure fairness and equity.

Policy Recommendations:

Workload Equity and Transparency. The success and well-being of the university faculty are essential and rely on a fair and manageable distribution of responsibilities. This initiative aims to understand workload patterns and ensure that burdens are not disproportionately placed on certain individuals or groups.

Targeted Support and Development. Equipping faculty with essential skills and strategies to effectively manage stress, optimize time utilization, and delegate tasks efficiently. It can enhance individual faculty members' capacity to cope with their workload, but also contributes to overall productivity and well-being. Faculty with numerous tasks in pairs promote professional development, skill acquisition, and knowledge exchange.

Gender-Sensitive Action. To address gender differences in workplace stress, the institutions should foster fairness and inclusivity throughout the academic community. Institutions should take proactive measures to protect the well-being and long-term retention of female faculty members by recognizing the unique issues they face. By systematically reviewing these processes, institutions can uncover any disparities that may disproportionately impact female faculty members.

Long-term focus on Sustainability. To improve retention, job satisfaction, and overall institutional effectiveness. Institutions can continue to change and grow in response to the shifting demands of their faculty community by continuously assessing and improving these programs. Implementing periodic surveys or focus groups to monitor faculty stress levels over time provides valuable insights into the evolving needs and challenges faced by faculty members.

CONCLUSIONS

The teaching faculty of the main and satellite campuses of Bukidnon State University comes from varied socio-demographic backgrounds in terms of age, sex, rank, designation, number of designations, and years in service. These variations contribute to their official designations and teaching performance. The faculty members are performing well when it comes to their fundamental functions, as evidenced by their dedication to teaching, research, and community engagement. Their commitment to high-quality education is reflected in positive student feedback and impressive academic outcomes. The moderate level of stress that faculty members experience is a reflection of the demanding nature of their multifaceted roles. Balancing teaching responsibilities, research obligations, administrative tasks, and community service often leads to a significant workload, which can be overwhelming. However, this stress also underscores their commitment to maintaining high standards in education and contributing valuable research. The outstanding performance of the teaching faculty is a testament to their dedication, expertise, and innovative approaches to education. Their ability to deliver engaging, effective instruction has resulted in high student satisfaction and academic success, fostering a positive learning environment. Faculty members consistently incorporate cutting-edge research and practical experiences into their curricula, enriching students' educational journeys and preparing them for future challenges. Female faculty members experience higher levels of job stress compared to their male counterparts, highlighting a significant gender disparity in the academic workplace. Interestingly, other factors such as age, rank, number of designations, and years in service do not exhibit a statistically significant impact on job stress among faculty members. Despite the various pressures associated with their roles, faculty members appear to maintain their life satisfaction independently of the specific stressors related to teaching, administrative, and research responsibilities. This indicates that other factors may play a more crucial role in influencing their life satisfaction. Despite the diverse and demanding range of responsibilities they face, faculty members are capable of effectively managing their workload and maintaining consistent levels of teaching performance. The ability to compartmentalize and balance these roles highlights the resilience and adaptability of faculty members, ensuring that their teaching quality remains unaffected by the varied pressures of their professional duties. The fundamental functions measured in the model, such as teaching, administrative duties, and research, are not the primary factors influencing teaching performance. Consequently, other variables outside these fundamental functions may play a more critical role in determining the teaching effectiveness of faculty members. The university can implement additional policies that could help faculty members better manage their job stress and, consequently, enhance their teaching performance. Additionally, creating avenues for regular feedback and evaluation can help identify areas of concern and provide opportunities for targeted intervention.

REFERENCES

- Dayagbil, F., Palompon, D., Garcia, L., Olvido, M. (2021). Teaching and learning continuity amid and beyond the pandemic. *Frontiers in Education*, 6(11), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.678692>
- Fathi, J., Greenier, V., & Derakhshan, A. (2021, July 1). Self-efficacy, reflection, and burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: The mediating role of emotion regulation. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2021.121043>
- Gayon, R. & Tan, D. (2021). Experiences of higher education institutions (HEI) teachers in the implementation of flexible learning. *Science International*, 33(1):47-52
- Huenneke, L. F., Stearns, D. M., Martinez, J. D., & Laurila, K. (2017). Key Strategies for Building Research Capacity of University Faculty Members. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42(5), 421–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-017-9394-y>
- Karaköse, T., Yirci, R., & Papadakis, S. (2021). Exploring the interrelationship between COVID-19 phobia, work–family conflict, family–work conflict, and life satisfaction among school administrators for advancing sustainable management. *Sustainability*, 13(15), 54-86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158654>
- Leiter, Michael P. (1993). *Burnout as a developmental process: Consideration of Models*, in Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Christina Maslach and Tadeusz Marek (eds.). Professional burnout. Recent Developments in Theory and Research. Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis
- Li, T., & Yang, X. (2023). Conflict or facilitation? Faculty members' teaching time and their research performance. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01071-3>
- Lin, C., & Huang, C. K. (2020). Employee turnover intentions and job performance from a planned change: the effects of an organizational learning culture and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 4(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm-08-2018-0281>
- Manalo, R. (2020). Teachers' occupational stress, organizational commitment, and work engagement of stem track public school: A proposed employee welfare program. *Occupational Stress, Organizational Commitment, Work Engagement*, 9(5), 12-22.
- Prasad, K., Vaidya, R. W., & Mangipudi, M. R. (2020, May 31). Effect of Occupational Stress and Remote Working on Psychological Well-Being of Employees: An empirical analysis during covid- 19 pandemic concerning information technology industry in hyderabad. *Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies*, 11(2), 1-15. DOI: 10.18843/ijcms/v11i2/01
- Räsänen, K., Pietarinen, J., Pyhältö, K., Soini, T., & Väisänen, P. (2020, May 27). Why leave the teaching profession? A longitudinal approach to the prevalence and persistence of teacher turnover intentions. *Social Psychology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-020-09567-x>
- Reymert, I., & Thune, T. (2023). Task complementarity in academic work: A study of the relationship between research, education and third mission tasks among university professors. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 48(1), 331–360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-021-09916-8>
- Sanchez-Gomez, M., & Bresó, E. (2020). In pursuit of work performance: Testing the contribution of emotional intelligence and burnout. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(15), 53-73. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155373>
- Soto-Rubio, A., Del Carmen Giménez-Espert, M., & Prado-Gascó, V. (2020). Effect of emotional intelligence and psychosocial risks on burnout, job satisfaction, and nurses' health during the COVID-19 pandemic.

International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 3(2), 56-87.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17217998>

- Suleman, Q., Syed, M. A., Mahmood, Z., & Hussain, I. (2020). Correlating emotional intelligence with job satisfaction: Evidence from a Cross-Sectional Study Among Secondary School Heads in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00240>
- Taggart, G. (2021). Administrative intensity and faculty job stress. *Innovative Higher Education*, 46(5), 605–621. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09573-7>
- Tarraya, H. (2023). Teachers' workload policy: Its impact on Philippine public school teachers. *Puissant*, 4. [//puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/246](https://puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/246)
- Tolentino, R. C. (2023). Organizational commitment and job performance of the academic and administrative personnel. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 15(1), 51-59
- Udayar, S., Fiori, M., & Bausseron, E. (2020). Emotional intelligence and performance in a stressful task: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109790>
- Uwizeye, D., Karimi, F., Thiong'o, C., Syonguvi, J., Ochieng, V., Kiroro, F., Gateri, A., Khisa, A. M., & Wao, H. (2022). Factors associated with research productivity in higher education institutions in Africa: A systematic review. *AAS Open Research*, 4(26), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.12688/aasopenres.13211.2>
- Xu, Y., & Wang, Y. (2023). Job stress and university faculty members' life satisfaction: The mediating role of emotional burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(11), 14-34. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1111434>
- Yosiana, Y., Hermawati, A., & Mas'ud, M. (2020). The analysis of workload and work environment on nurse performance with job stress as a mediation variable. *Journal of Socioeconomics and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.31328/jsed.v3i1.1326>
- Zhang, Y., Wang, C., Pan, W. (2024). Stress, burnout, and coping strategies of frontline nurses during the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan and Shanghai, China. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 4(12), 1-22. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.565520