Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2022, Vol. 6, No. 8, 4112-4126

Stress-Related Factors And Performance Of Academic Officials In A University

Juan O. Abarro

University of Rizal System Cardona , email address: johnnyoganaabarro@gmail.com

Abstract: The purpose of the study was to identify the factors that contributed to academic officials of the University of Rizal System's stress and performance during the 2018-2019 school year. The research was carried out at the University of Rizal System, with twenty (20) deans and forty-two (42) program heads participating. It made use of the Questionnaire Checklist that is created to answer the study's objectives. According to the study, variables such as human, material, and financial resources, administrative matters, and discharging roles cause moderate stress to university academic officials. Most of them received a "Very Satisfactory" overall rating and participated in one (1) extension project with limited research. Furthermore, there was no significant relationship between the variables that cause stress, such as human, material, and financial resources, administrative issues, discharging roles, academic officials' overall work performance, research conduct, and extension. The study found that variables such as human, material, financial, and administrative resources and discharging roles can cause moderate stress among university academic officials but have no effect on their overall performance or performance in research and instruction.

Keywords: Stress-related factors, performance of academic officials.

I. Introduction

The Dean is accountable for program implementation and instruction, research, extension, and production. Academic officials such as the Dean and Program Head are subjected to conditions that impact college operations. This condition refers to the unavoidable stress that employees face (Sahoo, 2016). A feeling of worry about a specific event is known as stress. It's also a mental illness that can impact an employee's life (Jarinto, 2013).

Ehsan and Ali (2019) conducted a study on the impact of work stress on employee productivity in the banking sector of Faisalabad, Pakistan. They emphasized that work overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity are stressors that cause employees' work performance to suffer. According to Harmsen, Lorenz, Maulana, and Veen (2018), five stressors affect teachers: high psychological task demands, negative social aspects, negative organizational aspects, a lack of developmental opportunities, and negative student aspects.

Several factors contribute to academic officials' stress. These factors influence them in various ways, such as a lack of financial rewards, inflexibility in work hours, and personal issues. Work overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity are all stressors that cause employees' work performance to suffer. In the second part of the article, Nekoranec and Kmosena (2015) explain some stress coping strategies, including gaining social support and taking advantage of stress coping programs.

According to Parashar, Ellawadi, Singh, and Jiloha

(2019), stress among teachers at a school in South Delhi, India, was caused by a lack of motivation from superiors. Hazardous working conditions also stressed teachers, according to the researchers. The majority of the faculty claimed to have had very few stressful experiences with their families. Aydin and Kaya (2016) investigated the sources of stress for teachers working in private elementary schools and stress management techniques.

Karihe, Namosonge, and Iravo (2015) discovered that the working environment, which includes personal and job resources, is a major source of stress that affects job performance. Without consultation and being given responsibility without the authority to make decisions, changes in terms and conditions caused the highest perceived work-related stress among teachers. Stress factors included a lack of funds/resources to complete the job and limited access to training.

Batonio Betonio (2014) discovered this in his study of stress factors and college faculty teaching performance. In economic stress, school policies and management practices stress, and with their families, the faculty experienced a moderate level of stress. The majority of the faculty claimed to have had very few stressful experiences with their families.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Methods

The study used a descriptive-correlational method of research utilizing the Survey Checklist developed to gather data.

2.2 Setting of the Study

The study was conducted on ten (10) campuses of the University of Rizal System, Province of Rizal. These campuses are located in the ten (10) municipalities of the province, such as Angono, Antipolo, Binangonan, Cainta, Cardona, Morong, Pililla, Rodriguez, Tanay, and Taytay.

2.3 Subject of the Study

The total number of people who responded to the survey was eighty (80), with twenty-five (25) Deans and fifty-five (55) Program Heads. This study used Slovin's Formula to figure out how big the sample should be. Using the formula, the sample size of the study was divided into two strata: twenty-one (21) Deans and forty-six (46) Program Heads, for a total of sixty-seven (67). However, 20 Deans and 42 Program Directors were able to complete the Questionnaire Checklist out of these figures. The computation results were chosen using a fishbowl technique and a stratified random sampling method. The researcher took 21 rolls of pieces of paper with the names of 25 Deans, which were individually listed on pieces of paper that were rolled and placed in a dish. The names of the 45 Program Heads were written on pieces of paper, rolled up, and placed in a container similarly. The study used 42 rolled papers with the names of the Program Directors on them. The names of those who were taken were written down on a sheet of paper, and the questionnaires were given to them.

2.4 Sources of Data

The data sources were the respondents' perceptions (Deans and Program Heads) on the Questionnaire Checklist consisting of two parts as the profile of the respondents and variables causing stress. The profile variables include the performance of Deans and Program Heads during the First and Second Semesters, the School Year 2018-2019. The factors causing stress included are issues relating to Human Resources, Materials, and Financial Resources; Administrative Matters; and Discharging of Roles. The Deans and Program Heads suggested specific items in the questionnaire checklist that are not part of the administration during the study. Some

officials of the Universities were also significant in the crafting of the questionnaire checklist.

Answer	Scale	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very Much Stressful (VMS)
4	3.41 – 4.20	Much Stressful (MuS)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Stressful (MoS)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Less Stressful (LeS)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Least Stressful(LeaS

2.5 Procedure of the Study

This study carried out the following activities to meet the study's objectives:

The researcher created a questionnaire. Each item was made using the ideas of five (5) deans, five (5) program heads, and five (5) other university officials who worked under the previous administration. They were each interviewed separately, and their responses were recorded while the researcher drafted the questionnaire. The Deans and Program Heads reviewed the checklist after it was created. One (1) medical doctor practitioner, one (1) research professor, one (1) statistician and one (1) grammarian were interviewed before the creation of the checklist. Based on the reviewer's suggestions, the questionnaire was revised. This then replicated it based on the number of targeted samples.

The researcher obtained a permit from the Control Office before the administration of the questionnaire (DCC). The researcher distributed the questionnaire checklists with the help of the Campus Directors, and the Enhanced Community Quarantine brought about an online modality (in google form) (ECQ). The printed questionnaire checklist was used to administer the questionnaire, and online modalities lasted six (6) months, beginning in January 2020 and ending in June 2020.

The checklist was evaluated by Five (5) faculty members of the University and scored using the Likert-5 Point Scale presented on page 8.

The data were tabulated according to statisticians' recommendations and sent to the University Statistical Center for computation.

The researcher analyzed the statistical computations' results, and he created a research report.

2.6 Statistical Treatment

The data were calculated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences by the researchers (SPSS). To answer the specific objectives of the study-specific objectives, the researcher used the following statistical tools. The level of stress experienced by University academic officials regarding human resources, material resources, financial responsibility, administrative matters, and role performance was determined using the mean.

The purpose of the study was to find out how well academic officials performed in terms of overall performance, verbal interpretation, and frequency distribution. The significance of the relationship between Deans' stress and performance was determined using Pearson's r. This study used frequency distribution to assess research and extension performance. The University of Massachusetts-Amherst also discovered a relationship between Program Heads' stress levels and their performance.

3. Results and Discussion

Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University concerning Issues Relating to Human Resources, Materials, and Financial Resources; Unusual Situations Relating to Administrative Matters; and Discharging Roles

Table 1 shows the mean level of stress among university academic officials regarding human resource issues.

As shown in the table, the items on a lack of faculty members to handle specific subjects in college and receiving information that faculty members require students to work on money-related projects received the highest overall mean perception of academic officials of 3.60 and 3.44, respectively, with a verbal interpretation of "Much Stressful." On the other hand, the academic officials' overall mean perceptions on different items have a verbal interpretation of "Moderately Stressful." In general, the average overall mean for human resource issues was 3.44, with the verbal interpretation of "Moderately Stressful."

Human resources, such as faculty members, play an essential role in implementing a college's programs and projects. According to Ahmad, Hussain, Muhammad, Qureshi, and Mufti (2015), employee inadequacy and behavior are stressors for organization administrators. They argue that higher authorities should prioritize the provision of human resources to reduce stress among middle-level executives.

Table 1 Mean on the Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University with respect to Issues Relating to Human Resources

Inadequacies and Late Provisions of Human Resources Provision	Dean		Program Head		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
1. Insufficient number of personnel to handle various activities in the office	3.65	MuS	3.21	MoS	3.35	MoS
2. Scarcity of faculty members to handle some subjects in college	3.65	MuS	3.57	MuS	3.60	MuS
3. Late submission of faculty members on various documents such as course syllabi, examinations, grade sheets	3.50	MuS	3.24	MoS	3.32	MoS
4. Tardiness of faculty members in reporting to class	3.55	MuS	3.14	MoS	3.27	MoS
5. Unreasonable absences of faculty members	3.05	MoS	2.95	MoS	2.98	MoS
6. Receiving information that faculty members are requiring students on projects involving money	3.50	MuS	3.40	MoS	3.44	MuS
7. Non-participation of faculty members in attaining other activities of the college.	3.25	MoS	3.19	MoS	3.21	MoS
8. Handling conflict among faculty members	2.95	MoS	3.29	MoS	3.18	MoS
9. Handling conflict among students	2.95	MoS	3.12	MoS	3.06	MoS
10. Handling conflict between parents and faculty members	2.70	MoS	3.07	MoS	2.95	MoS
Average	3.28	MoS	3.22	Mo	3.24	MoS

Legend: Mu - Much Stressful MoS – Moderately Stressful

Table 2 presents the level of stress of academic officials of the university concerning issues relating to material resources.

The various items on material resource issues received an overall mean of 3.39, with a verbal interpretation of "Moderately Stressful" (Table 2). According to Okongo et al. (2015), teaching and learning materials are essential resources in delivering the education curriculum. Sutuma (2017) also discovered that a lack of instructional resources and facilities impacts graduate outcomes in a higher education institution. Inadequate materials, instructional materials, and classrooms in the college may prevent activities from being implemented. Despite this, academic officials are stressed to a moderate degree. In other words, they can cope with their stress when this factor occurs. In contrast, Karihe, Namosonge, and Iravo (2015) discovered that working conditions, including personal and job resources, are a major source of stress. This means that when problems with material resources in their college arise, academic officials can manage their stress.

Table 2 Mean on the Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University with Respect to Issues Relating to Material Resources

Issues Relating to Materials Resources	Dean		Program Head		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
1. Lack of supplies and equipment for use in the office	3.30	MoS	3.45	MuS	3.40	MoS
2. Insufficient number of instructional materials	3.45	MuS	3.36	MoS	3.39	MoS
3. Insufficient number of classrooms	3.35	MoS	3.55	MuS	3.48	MoS
4. Low quality of supplies and materials issued by the supply office	3.25	MoS	3.36	MoS	3.32	MoS
5. Delayed issuance of supplies, materials, and equipment by the supply office	3.50	MuS	3.33	MoS	3.39	MoS
6. Poor maintenance and improvement of facilities	3.35	MoS	3.36	MoS	3.35	MoS
Average	3.37	MoS	3.40	MoS	3.39	MoS

Table 3 Mean on the Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University with respect Issues Relating to Financial Resources

Issues Relating to Financial Resources	Dean		Program Head		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
1. The insufficient budgetary allocation of the college	3.70	MuS	3.29	MoS	3.42	MuS
2. Lack of funds for the office and activities of the college	3.70	MuS	3.57	MuS	3.61	MuS
3. Late payment of honorarium of faculty members such as overload in teaching	3.55	MuS	3.55	MuS	3.55	MuS
4. Fund sourcing or trying to gain financial support for the college	3.20	MoS	3.29	MoS	3.26	MoS
5. Prohibition for income generation	3.00	MoS	3.12	MoS	3.08	MoS

Average	3.43	MuS	3.36	MuS	3.38	MoS

Table 3 shows the average level of stress among university academic officials regarding financial resource issues.

The items dealing with financial resources, such as a lack of funds for the office and activities, had the highest overall mean of 3.61, according to Table 3. The item with the highest overall mean, as well as the items on late payment of faculty honoraria, such as overload in teaching, and insufficient budgetary allocation of the college, have a verbal interpretation of "Much Stressful." The overall stress level of the other items was rated as "Moderately Stressful." This means that when it comes to financial resources, Deans and Program Heads are under moderate stress. Even though financial resources are a critical component in implementing programs and projects, they are not significantly impacted. This implies that academic officials are aware of how to deal with stress caused by these factors. This contradicts Alson (2019), who discovered that financial inadequacy has an impact on teacher performance.

Table 4 Mean on the Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University with respect to issues Relating to Administrative Matters

Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	Dean		Program Head		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
1. Low-performance rating	3.25	MoS	3.14	MoS	3.18	MoS
2. Mistrust of the immediate supervisor	2.90	MoS	2.88	MoS	2.89	MoS
3. Receiving insufficient recognition for performing administrative/supervisory functions	2.80	MoS	3.02	MoS	2.95	MoS
4. Non-observance of protocols by other University Officials	3.05	MoS	2.88	MoS	2.94	MoS
5. Additional committee assignment was given by higher authorities	3.05	MoS	3.12	MoS	3.10	MoS
6. Lack of freedom to decide	2.70	MoS	3.12	MoS	2.98	MoS
Average	2.96	MoS	3.03	MoS	3.01	MoS

Table 4 shows the mean level of stress experienced by university academic officials when dealing with administrative issues.

The item on mistrust of the immediate supervisor received the lowest overall mean perception of 2.89. In contrast, issues relating to administrative matters concerning the item's low-performance rating received the highest general mean perception of 3.18. All of the items in administrative matters had an average overall mean of 3.01, which was translated as "Moderately Satisfied" verbally.

The findings show that academic officials are moderately stressed when dealing with administrative issues. Administrative procedures are those put in place by the university's higher authorities. Betonio's (2015) finding that administrative practices can cause moderate stress among college faculty is supported by the data.

Table 5 Mean on the Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University with Respect \to Discharging of Roles.

Discharging of Roles	Dean		Program Head		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI

1. Facilitating the development of plans	2.85	MoS	3.07	MoS	3.00	MoS
2. Preparations of quarterly and annual reports	2.95	MoS	2.98	MoS	2.97	MoS
3. Implementation of policies and programs of the University	3.05	MoS	3.05	MoS	3.05	MoS
4. Compliance of government regulations	3.00	MoS	2.71	MoS	2.81	MoS
5. Performing supervisory functions of the college	2.75	MoS	2.62	MoS	2.66	MoS
6. Reviewing and updating of course syllabi with many errors	3.40	MoS	2.81	MoS	3.00	MoS
7. Evaluating of professional activities of faculty	3.00	MoS	2.55	MoS	2.69	MoS
8. Untimely scheduling of meetings by the immediate supervisor	3.15	MoS	2.40	MoS	2.65	MoS
9. Coordinating tasks to stakeholders	2.70	MoS	2.57	LeS	2.61	MoS
10. Have insufficient authority to perform college responsibilities	2.85	MoS	2.40	LeS	2.55	MoS
Average	2.97	MoS	2.72	MoS	2.80	MoS

Legend: LeS – Less Stressful

Table 5 shows the mean level of stress experienced by university academic officials when performing their duties.

As shown in Table 5, the variables related to discharging roles in the implementation of University policies and programs had the highest overall mean perception of 3.05. The item "lack of authority to carry out college responsibilities" had the lowest general mean perception of 2.55. The verbal interpretation of 'Moderately Stressful' can be found in the highest, lowest, and other overall means. The overall mean score was 2.80, with a verbal interpretation of Moderately Stressful.

According to the data, academic officials experience moderate stress when implementing University policies and programs. This is especially true when faculty members and stakeholders are unwilling to work together (Ehsan & Ali, 2019). The data also shows that high blood pressure is caused by stress factors such as paperwork and planning meetings and conferences, which are brought on by the ranks of faculty members (Quiros & Gemora, 2018).

Table 6 Composite table Level of the stress of Academic Officials of the University of Rizal System

Aspect	Dean		Program Head		Grand Mean	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
A. Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	3.28	MoS	3.22	MoS	3.24	MoS
B. Issues Relating to Materials Resources	3.37	MoS	3.40	MoS	3.39	MoS
C. Issues Relating to Financial Resources	3.43	MoS	3.36	MoS	3.38	MoS
D. Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	2.96	MoS	3.03	MoS	3.01	MoS
E. Discharging of Roles	2.97	MoS	2.72	MoS	2.80	MoS
Overall	3.20	MoS	3.15	moS	3.16	MoS

Table 6 shows the Academic Officials of the University of Rizal System's Composite Stress Level.

The grand mean of 3.39 was found in the composite table, while the grand mean of 2.80 was found in the table for "issues relating to material resources." The stress variables' overall grand mean was 3.16, with a verbal interpretation of "Moderately Stressful."

The data shows that variables related to job-related issues caused moderate stress among University academic officials. This emphasizes that the study's various variables caused moderate stress among academic officials. This means that when confronted with stress-related factors, the University's academic officials can manage stress.

Level of Performance of Academic Officials of the University in Terms of Instruction, Research and Extension

Table 7 presents the performance of academic officials of the University concerning instruction, research, and extension.

Table 7Performance of Academic Officials of the University with Work Performance Research & Extension

Performance Rating	Dean		Program Head		Overall	
	F	%	F	%	f	%
Outstanding	3	15.0	3	7.1	6	9.7
Very Satisfactory	17	85.0	39	92.9	56	90.3
Total	20	100.0	42	100.0	62	100.0
No. of Research Conducted						
1	9	45.0	12	28.6	21	33.9
2			2	4.8	2	3.2
0	11	55.0	28	66.7	39	62.9
Total	20	100.0	42	100.0	62	100.0
No. of Extension Participated						
1	13	65.0	19	45.2	32	51.6
2	1	5.0	2	4.8	3	4.8
3			1	2.4	1	1.6
0	6	30.0	20	47.6	26	41.9
Total	20	100.0	42	100.0	62	100.0

As shown in Table 7, most academic officials' work performance was rated as 'Very Satisfactory,' with only 6% receiving an 'Outstanding' rating. Academic officials' work performance is higher than average, according to the data. Based on academic rank, this data emphasizes that academic officials are also faculty members. According to Agsalud (2017), the teaching effectiveness of faculty members at Pangasinan State University is "very satisfactory." Aside from that, faculty members in the Philippines University technology program were rated "Very Satisfactory" in their teaching abilities (Johansen Caluza et al., 2017).

In terms of research, most academic officials, 39 or 62 percent, did not conduct any. Still, the second-highest number, 21 or 33.9 percent, did one, and the lowest number, 2 or 3.2 percent, did two—faculty members who conduct research account for 37% of the total. The outcome demonstrates that they can conduct research even if they are under moderate stress.

In terms of extension, most academic officials (32 or 51.6 percent) participated, while 1 or 1.6 percent did not, for a total of 33 or 58 percent. On the other hand, 26 or 49.9% or 50% did not participate in the extension process. The findings reveal that academic officials are more likely to conduct extensions. Furthermore, more officials were involved in the extension process than in the research process. The significance of this fact lies in the fact that research is in charge of designing what the extension will provide to the community. To put it another way, researching that extent is much more difficult. As a result, there are a greater number of academic officials who are willing to conduct extensions.

Significant Relationship Between the Level of Stress and Performance of Academic Officials concerning the Different Variables

Table 8 p-values on Relationship Between the Level of Stress and Performance of Academic Officials concerning the Different Variables

Performance	Variables	Pearson-r	df	p-Value	H_O	VI
Performance Rating	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	11.281	24	.987	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	23.511	17	.133	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	24.246	16	.084	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	25.676	23	.316	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	32.827	27	.203	FR	NS
	Average	50.560	55	.645	FR	NS
No. of Research	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	60.668	48	.104	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	43.077	34	.137	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	29.405	32	.599	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	39.911	46	.724	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	37.543	54	.957	FR	NS
	Average	117.187	110	.302	FR	NS
No. of Extension	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	68.737	72	.587	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	36.491	51	.937	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	57.513	48	.163	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	77.203	69	.233	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	62.166	81	.941	FR	NS

	Average	149.486	165	.801	FR	NS

Legend: df – Degrees of Significance Ho – Decision
FR – Fail to Reject NS – Not Significant

Table 8 shows the p-values for the relationship between stress levels and academic officials' performance with the various variables.

Table 8 revealed that the p-values on the level of stress-related factors and academic officials' performance on issues relating to human, material, and administrative matters, discharging roles all had p-values greater than .05 level of significance, indicating that the null hypothesis was rejected. This means there isn't enough evidence to dismiss the Null Hypothesis. As a result, the outcome is insignificant. This emphasizes that academic officials' performance in semestral evaluation, research, and the extension will not be affected regardless of the level of stress-related factors they face.

The findings show no significant link between the stress variables used in this study and work performance, although some research was conducted and extension participants were involved. In other words, stress-related variables do not affect academic officials of the University of Rizal System's performance.

The findings revealed that other stressors influence the performance of the University's academic officials. According to Narciso (2017), there is no significant link between work stress and performance. However, Jalagat (2017) found a significant relationship between job stress and job performance in his study on the determinants of job stress and their impact on employee job performance.

The findings show that the variables studied, such as human, material, financial, and administrative resources, and role discharging, have no bearing on academic officials' performance.

Significant Relationship Between the Level of Stress and Performance of Academic Officials concerning the Different Variables

The p-values for the relationship between Deans' level of stress and performance for the various variables are shown in Table 9.

The p-values on the level of stress variables of the Deans concerning issues relating to human, material, and administrative matters, discharging roles, obtained high p-values greater than .05 level of significance, paving the way to Fail to Reject the Null Hypothesis with a verbal interpretation of Not Significant, as shown in Table 9.

The findings show no significant relationship between the stress variables used in this study and work performance, although some research was conducted and extension participants were involved. In other words, stress-related variables have no bearing on the performance of University of Rizal System Deans.

Work overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity are work stress factors that harm the work environment and decrease performance. Harmsen, Lorenz, Maulana, and Veen (2018) also identified five stressors that affect teachers. High psychological task demands, negative social aspects, negative organizational aspects, a lack of developmental opportunities, and negative pupil aspects are some of these factors.

In general, the variables examined in the study, such as human, material, and financial resources, and

administrative and role-related issues, have no bearing on academic officials' performance.

Table 9 p-values on the Relationship Between the Level of Stress and Performance of Deans concerning the Different Variables.

Performance Variable	Stress Variables	Pearson-r	df	p-values	H_O	VI
Performance Rating	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	10.850	12	.542	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	10.850	13	.623	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	10.850	12	.542	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	16.078	15	.377	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	16.078	16	.448	FR	NS
	Average	20.000	19	.395	FR	NS
No. of Research	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	13.266	12	.350	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	12.593	13	.480	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	17.980	12	.116	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	15.960	15	.385	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	15.960	16	.456	FR	NS
	Average	20.000	19	.395	FR	NS
No. of Extension	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	25.983	24	.354	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	24.444	26	.551	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	18.333	24	.787	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	21.026	30	.887	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	24.359	32	.831	FR	NS
	Average	40.000	38	.381	FR	NS

Significant Relationship Between the Level of Stress and Performance of Programs Heads concerning the Different Variables

Table 10 shows the p-values for the various variables in the relationship between stress levels and program head performance.

The p-values for the relationship between the stress variables concerning financial resources and administrative matters, and the overall performance of Program Heads, as shown in Table 9, were.000 and.002, respectively, which is less than.05 level of significance. The result was significant in rejecting the Null Hypothesis. The findings show that financial resources and administrative issues are linked to the Program Heads' overall performance. In other words, issues with financial resources and administrative matters impact the overall performance of the Program Heads. Employees at

universities are often the executors of University programs and projects that require funding. Lack of financial rewards, inflexibility in work hours, personal issues, low control over the work environment, and management system are factors causing stress among employees, according to Ekienabor, E. (2019) in his article on the impact of job stress on employees' productivity and commitment.

Table 10 p-values on the Relationship Between the Level of Stress and Performance of Program Heads concerning the Different Variables

Performance Variable	Stress Variables	Pearson-r	df	Sig.	H_O	VI
Over-all Performance	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	8.579	19	.980	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	21.897	15	.111	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	42.000	14	.000	R	S
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	30.692	17	.022	R	S
	Discharging of Roles	24.410	18	.142	FR	NS
	Average	42.000	37	.263	FR	NS
Research	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	50.083	38	.091	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	44.000	30	.048	R	S
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	25.583	28	.596	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	33.649	34	.485	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	25.083	36	.914	FR	NS
	Average	81.500	74	.257	FR	NS
Extension	Issues Relating to Human Resources Provision	84.142	57	.011	R	S
	Issues Relating to Material Resources	31.468	45	.937	FR	NS
	Issues Relating to Financial Resources	60.436	42	.032	R	S
	Issues Relating to Administrative Matters	59.049	51	.205	FR	NS
	Discharging of Roles	46.651	54	.751	FR	NS
	Average	101.795	111	.723	FR	NS

Human and material resources, role discharge, and overall performance, on the other hand, received high p-values when compared to the 0.5 level of significance. With a verbal interpretation of Not Significant, the result failed to reject the null hypothesis. The data demonstrates that the Dean bears the brunt of the responsibility when human and material resources are not adequately considered because I am in charge of academic leadership.

The p-value obtained for the relationship between the stress variables relating to material resources and the performance of the Program head in the conduct of research was.048, which is less than the .05 level of significance. The result was significant in rejecting the Null Hypothesis. The findings show

that stress variables such as issues with material resources are linked to the Program Heads' research performance. Conducting research is a difficult task. There are many activities one can engage in before the University allows them to conduct research. It will begin with the approval of the title and proposal, followed by the study's conduct, and finally, the manuscript's writing. Each activity requires a significant amount of time to complete. The purpose of this is to ensure that the research is carried out by the University's and other institutions' agendas. However, if officials experience moderate stress in their primary job, they will no longer bother to conduct research.

Human, financial, and administrative issues and the discharge of roles and performance in the conduct of research received high p-values compared to the 0.5 level of significance. With a verbal interpretation of Not Significant, the result failed to reject the null hypothesis. This means that these variables have no bearing on the Program Heads' performance. Their performance is the same whether they are stressed or not.

The p-values obtained for the relationship between the stress variables concerning human and financial resources and performance in the conduct of extension are .011 and.032, respectively, which are less than the .05 level of significance. The result was significant in rejecting the Null Hypothesis. The findings show that stress variables such as human and financial resource issues are linked to the program director's performance in the long run. In other words, the program directors investigate whether they emphasize aspects of human and financial resource issues. It implies that management should take the necessary steps to resolve human and financial resource issues.

In comparison to the 0.5 level of significance, issues relating to material resources, administrative matters, and the discharge of roles and performance in extension have high p-values. With a verbal interpretation of Not Significant, the result failed to reject the null hypothesis. This means that these variables have no bearing on how the extension is carried out.

Mali's manufacturing sector is one of the most stressful places in the world. According to Bamba (2016), the study found various sources of occupational stress investment at work. Ambiguities and overload conflicts of roles of responsibilities, lack of job security, thwarted ambitions, complicated professional relationships with supervisors, colleagues, subordinates, difficulties of delegation of authority, family, and personal life are also sources of stress.

4. Conclusions

The variables used in this study, such as issues involving human, material, financial, and administrative resources and discharging roles, can cause moderate stress among university academic officials. Academic officials' performance and performance in research and extension will be unaffected by the variables they face. Issues relating to financial resources and administrative matters and the overall performance of program heads will all impact research performance. Human and financial resources will influence the performance of the program heads in extension.

5. References

1. Ahmad, A., Hussain, A., Saleem, M.Q., Qureshi, M.A., & Mufti, N.A. (2015). Workplace stress: A Critical Insight of Causes, Effects, and Interventions.
2. Agai-Demjaha, T., Minov, J., Stoleski, S., & Zafirova, B. (2015). Stress causing factors among teachers in elementary schools and their relationship with demographic and job characteristics. Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences, 3(3), 493–499. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.077

3. Agsalud, P. L. (2017). Teaching Effectiveness of the Teacher Education Faculty Members at Pangasinan State University Asingan Campus, Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 5(1), 16–22. www.apjmr.com
4. Alson, J. (2019). Stress among public school teachers. Journal of Research Initiatives: Vol. 4: No. 2, Article 3. Available at: https://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/jri/vol4/iss2/3
5. Aydin, B., & Kaya, A. (2016). Sources of stress for teachers working in private elementary schools and methods of coping with stress. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4(12A), 186–195. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.041324
6. Bamba, M. (2016). Stress management and job performance in the industries sector of Mali. Journal of Service Science and Management, 9, 189-194. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2016.93023
7. Betonio, J. R. (2014). Stress factors and the teaching performance of the college faculty. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 5(7), 651–655. https://doi.org/10.7763/ijssh.2015.v5.534
8. Colacion-quiros, H., & Gemora, R. B. (2016). Causes and effects of stress among faculty members at a State University. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 4(1), 18–27.
9. Celine, F. (2018). Effects of job stress on employee performance in an enterprise, Central University of Applied Sciences, Thesis. https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/145790/Celine%20Fonkeng%20pdf.pdf.
10. Ekienabor, E. (2019). Impact of job stress on employees' productivity and commitment. International Journal of Research in Business. 2. 124-133.
11. Ehsan, M., & Ali, K. (2019). The impact of work stress on employee productivity: Based on the banking sector of Faisalabad, Pakistan. International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development, 4(6), 32–50. https://doi.org/10.18775/ijied.1849-7551-7020.2015.46.2003
12. Fonkeng, C. (2018). Effects of job stress on employee performance in an enterprise. Centria University of Applied Science (Master Thesis). Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/reader/161427435
13. Herring, P. & R. (2013). StREss in THe Workplace. Advocate.
14. Harmsen, R. Lorenz, M. Maulana, R. & Veen, K. (2018). The relationship between beginning teachers' stress causes stress responses, teaching behavior, and attrition. 24:6, 626-643. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1465404

I. L. O. (2016). a Collective Challenge World Day for Safety and Health at Work. In Cambridge University Press (Issue April 2016). www.ilo.org/safeday

15. Ismail, Azman et al. (2015). Effect of workplace stress on job performance, Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business, University of Tuzla, 13(1), 45-57. Agai-Demjaha, T., Minov, J., Stoleski, S., & Zafirova, B. (2015). Stress causing factors among teachers in elementary schools and their relationship with demographic and job characteristics. Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences, 3(3), 493–499. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.077
16. Jarinto, K. (2013). "Understanding Stress": Comparing between US, Japanese, and Thai Management Styles. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2282280
17. Johansen Caluza, L. B., Grace Function, D. D., Verecio, R. L., Cinco, J. C., Quisumbing, L. A., Lester Laurente, M., & Gotardo, M. A. (2017). Faculty Performance Evaluation in A Philippine University Information Technology Program. IOSR Journal Of Humanities And

Social Science, 22(8), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2209082836
18. Katic, I., Kneževic, T., Berber, N. 2, Ivaniševic, A. and Leber, M. (2019). The impact of stress on life, working, and management styles: How to make an organization healthier? Sustainability, 11(15), 4026; https://doi.org/10.3390/su11154026
19. Kaur, N. (2016). EVALUATION OF FACTORS CAUSING STRESS AMONG SCHOOL TEACHERS Supervisor : Darina Reilly Declaration :
20. Narciso, RM. C. (2017). Work stress and performance of UM Tagum College Faculty. International Journal of Advancements in Research & Technology, 6:2, 13-22.
21. Nekoranec, J., & Kmosena, M. (2015). Stress in the workplace – sources, effects. Review of the Air Force Academy, 1(1), 163–170.
22. Okongo, R.B., Ngao, G., Rop, N.K., & Nyongesa, W.J. (2015). Effect of Availability of Teaching and Learning Resources on the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Preschool Centers in n Nyamira North Sub-County, Nyamira County, Kenya. Journal of Education and Practice, 6(35), 132–141. http://ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1773227117?accountid=15182
23. Parashar, M., Ellawadi, D., Singh, M., and Jiloha, RC. (2019). Level of stress among schoolteachers of a school in South Delhi, India. CHRISMED J Health Res; 6:150-5.
24. Sutuma, E. (2017). Impacts of Insufficient Instructional Materials on Teaching Biology: Higher Education Systems in Focus. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 12(1), 2–8. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1140551
25. Tan, J.S. T. (2017). Factors affecting stress among faculty members of public universities in the Philippines: A Multiple Regression Analysis. International Journal of Psychological Studies, 9:3, 64-78, http://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v9n3p64
26. Young, Pakenham, and Norwood (2018) Thematic analysis of aid workers' stressors and coping strategies: work, psychological, lifestyle, and social dimensions. Journal of International Humanitarian Action. 3:19, 2-16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-018-0046-3
27. Zekaj, X. (2015). Impact of stress on teachers' productivity as an important factor in the increase in educational quality. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 6(2s2), 245–251. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s2p245

6. Acknowledgment

The University of Rizal System provided the fund used in the study, and the researcher wishes to express his gratitude to them.