

Influence of Self-Efficacy, Teachers' Stress, and Demographics on the Teachers' Work Commitment and Intention to Stay

Christine Joy C. Borres^{1*}, Joel D. Potane²

¹Capitol University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

²City College of Cagayan de Oro City, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: christine22borres@gmail.com

Date received: June 19, 2024

Date revised: July 10, 2024

Date accepted: July 16, 2024

Originality: 92%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 8%

Recommended citation:

Borres, C.J., & Potane, J. (2024). Influence of self-efficacy, teachers' stress, and demographics on the teachers' work commitment and intention to stay. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(8), 496-511.

<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0296>

Abstract. The study aimed to determine the influence of self-efficacy, stress, and demographics on work commitment and intention to stay among elementary public school teachers. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to ascertain the relationship between and among the variables. Regression analysis was used to establish which existing variables significantly affected teachers' work commitment and intention to stay. Proportionate stratified random sampling was used to select 126 teacher respondents. Data were gathered through survey questionnaires validated by experts. Results revealed that teachers have high self-efficacy, moderate stress, moderate commitment, and high intention to stay. There was a significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy when grouped by age and gender, while stress showed no significant difference concerning demographics. Teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement impacts work commitment. Teachers' stress in terms of workload and instrumental support are significant predictors of teachers' work commitment. Additionally, gender and teaching experience were significant predictors of work commitment. While teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement significantly influenced their intention to stay, teachers' stress did not influence their intention to stay. Similarly, none of the examined demographic profiles significantly influenced teachers' intention to stay. Moreover, commitment to students and school statistically influenced teachers' intention to stay. In conclusion, teachers with a strong sense of efficacy in student engagement demonstrate a more profound commitment to their work. The major concepts of George Homans' Social Exchange Theory hold because teachers' high levels of self-efficacy across domains suggest a positive exchange dynamic within the educational environment.

Keywords: Commitment; Demographics; Intention to stay; Self-efficacy; Stress; Teachers.

1.0 Introduction

The teaching profession is essential in the development and success of societies worldwide. One of the most crucial factors influencing a teacher's intention to stay in the profession is their level of work commitment. In the study by Cagape et al. (2021) on work commitment among public school teachers in Davao City, Philippines, teachers' dedication to their work is emphasized. It highlights that teachers must maintain a strong commitment to delivering excellent learning experiences accessible to all learners. Despite the negative impact of social and psychological factors, teachers' determination to remain in the profession reflects their professional commitment (Ulaş & Şenel, 2020).

However, teachers' intention to stay remains a significant issue in many educational systems (Shuls & Flores, 2020). In the Philippine context, some teachers leave public schools in the Philippines and seek other careers that are typically unrelated to teaching. Some may pursue their dreams abroad or seek new jobs in different educational institutions (Jordan & Oliva, 2022), leading to HR challenges like recruitment costs, training, and losses from hiring inexperienced teachers. In connection to teachers' work commitment, self-efficacy plays a vital role in influencing work commitment as it represents an individual's confidence in their ability to complete tasks effectively (Zeb & Nawaz, 2016). Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to invest more effort and exhibit greater dedication to their work. One of the studies conducted in the Philippines indicates that the teachers had high levels of self-efficacy in their ability to engage students and their capacity to develop and implement effective teaching strategies (Antonio, 2023). Consequently, highly committed teachers in private and public schools in the Philippines exhibit better performance, intention to stay, and a solid enthusiasm to contribute to the school's overall success (Malagsic et al., 2021).

Despite teaching being a noble profession, the working circumstances of teachers may lead to higher stress levels (Kabito & Wami, 2020). The study by Rabago-Mingoa (2017) found that teachers in secondary schools in the Philippines face high stress levels related to their jobs. This stress can be attributed to factors including the demands of their profession. Additionally, personal factors like difficulties in balancing work and personal life, along with economic aspects such as salaries and insufficient compensation, also increased the stress these teachers experienced. These factors can result in physical and mental fatigue, leading to poor performance and difficulty completing tasks (Torkaman et al., 2017), which may affect their commitment as teachers. Moreover, teachers' mental health can indirectly impact their students (Agyapong et al., 2022). When teachers are experiencing mental health issues, it can create a less conducive learning environment, potentially hindering the academic growth of their students.

In this context, it has been observed that demographic factors like gender and age can impact teachers' stress levels (Bashaija et al., 2022; Agai-Demjaha et al., 2015). On the other hand, in Philippine public schools, demographic factors like age, position, and education showed no influence on teachers' work commitment. However, a connection was found between teachers' gender and their commitment to their work, with female educators displaying a higher level of commitment than their male counterparts (Cagape et al., 2021). Nevertheless, further research is needed to explore the connection between demographic factors and teachers' efficacy, stress, commitment, and intention to stay, particularly within the Philippine public school setting. Also, only a few studies in the Philippine setting explore the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy, stress, demographics, and teachers' commitment and intention to stay in the profession, particularly within public schools. Thus, a research gap exists in understanding how these factors influence teachers' work commitment and decision to remain in the profession and within their respective organizations.

Hence, this study investigated the influence of self-efficacy, teachers' stress, and demographics on teachers' work commitment and intention to stay. Specifically, it examined the extent to which teachers' self-efficacy, stress, and demographics predict teachers' work commitment and intention to stay.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design. Correlational research helps predict and explain relationships between variables without conducting experiments (Seeram, 2019). The descriptive design ascertained teachers' self-efficacy regarding student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Moreover, it determined the teachers' stress in terms of workload, student behavior, and instrumental support. Then, it was used to identify the level of teachers' work commitment in terms of commitment to students, commitment to teaching, commitment to school, and commitment to the profession. It was also used to determine the teachers' intention to stay. According to Siedlecki (2020), descriptive methods provide methodical, factual, and accurate descriptions regarding the information, characteristics, and connections of the phenomenon under study. Likewise, this research design makes it possible to identify the study's research variables' features, frequency patterns, trends, and categorizations. Finally, ANOVA was utilized to determine whether there were significant differences among variables. Then regression was employed to establish which existing variables significantly affected teachers' work commitment and intention to stay.

2.2 Research Locale

The study was conducted in the eight (8) public elementary schools of the Don Carlos I district, located in the Northern part of Bukidnon, under the Division of Bukidnon. Bukidnon is a landlocked province in the Northern Mindanao region of the Philippines. It is known for its mountainous terrain, extensive forests, and agricultural lands that produce a variety of crops. Also, it is home to several indigenous tribes, such as the Bukidnon, Higaonon, Manobo, Matigsalug, Talaandig, Tigwahanon, and Umayamnon. Furthermore, Bukidnon is also a popular destination for ecotourism and adventure activities. Don Carlos is a municipality located in the Bukidnon province of the Philippines.

2.3 Research Participants

The study's respondents included public elementary teachers from eight (8) public elementary schools in the Don Carlos I district for the school year 2023-2024. The respondents were randomly selected using a list randomizer. All the schools are under the Division of Bukidnon, Region X. The population comprises 186 permanent public elementary school teachers. Using the Raosoft Calculator, with a margin of error of 5% and a confidence level of 95%, a sample size of 126 was generated.

2.4 Research Instrument

The study utilized a survey questionnaire divided into five parts. Part I collected demographic information such as age, gender, position, teaching experience, and educational attainment. Part II assessed teachers' self-efficacy using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). Part III was a researcher-made questionnaire that evaluated teachers' stress. Part IV measured teacher work commitment using the Teacher Commitment Scale by Thien et al. (2014), with modifications for clarity. Part V, developed by the researcher, assessed teachers' intention to stay and was informed by studies on school leadership, compensation, support, workload, and career development. To evaluate the instrument's validity, the Content Validity Index and Face Validity Index were calculated as described by Yusoff (2019), achieving satisfactory levels. Pilot testing with 30 public elementary teachers from a different district confirmed reliability, with Cronbach's Alpha ranging from 0.702 to 0.945 across various domains. In the rule of thumb for Cronbach's alpha, a value of 0.70 above is acceptable, 0.80 above is good, and a value above 0.90 is considered excellent (George & Mallery, 2003).

2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

To gather data for the study, the researcher first sought permission from the Schools Division Superintendent to conduct the survey. Upon approval, requests were sent to the Public Schools District Supervisor and the School Principals of the participating elementary schools. With their consent, teacher-respondents signed a consent form before completing the questionnaire. The researcher distributed the questionnaires with instructions, emphasizing thoughtful and truthful responses to ensure accuracy. Additionally, the researcher conducted Key Informant Interviews (KII) with five teachers to deepen the discussion and counter-validate the quantitative results. The data was then tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

This research adhered to ethical principles, ensuring the voluntary participation of the respondents who had the freedom to join or withdraw from the study at any stage. Measures were taken to minimize any potential harm, including physical, social, and psychological while safeguarding the dignity and well-being of the teacher participants. Confidentiality of research data was maintained throughout, protecting the rights of respondents and upholding scientific integrity. Furthermore, to prevent research misconduct, proper dissemination of results was ensured.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Teachers' Demographic Profile

Table 1 shows the age distribution of the respondents. The largest group is the 30-39 years category, with 46 respondents (36.5%). Next is the 40-49 years category with 37 respondents (29.4%), followed by the 50-59 years category with 26 respondents (20.6%). The 20-29 years category has 13 respondents (10.3%); the smallest group is the 60-65 years category with four respondents (3.2%). This indicates that a significant portion of teachers are young and active.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of age

Age (in years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
20-29	13	10.3
30-39	46	36.5
40-49	37	29.4
50-59	26	20.6
60-65	4	3.2
Total	126	100.0

Table 2 shows the gender distribution of survey respondents. Most respondents are female, with 106 individuals (84.1%), while 20 males comprise 15.9%. This suggests that teaching remains predominantly female-dominated. Sarabia (2020) noted that teaching, especially in basic schools, is a common employment option for women.

Table 2. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	20	15.9
Female	106	84.1
Total	126	100.0

Table 3 shows the positions of survey respondents. The largest group is "Teacher 1" with 77 respondents (61.1%), followed by "Teacher 3" with 29 respondents (23.0%). "Teacher 2" has nine respondents (7.1%), "Master Teacher 1" has eight respondents (6.3%), and "Master Teacher 2" is the least common with three respondents (2.4%).

Table 3. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of position

Position	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Teacher 1	77	61.1
Teacher 2	9	7.1
Teacher 3	29	23.0
Master Teacher 1	8	6.3
Master teacher 2	3	2.4
Total	126	100.0

This result indicates that only a few teacher respondents were promoted from Teacher 1 to higher positions, highlighting challenges in career advancement. Sarabia (2020) attributes this to a lack of training and opportunities for advanced education. Furthermore, Leyne (2019) emphasizes strong competition and numerous requirements as additional barriers. Additionally, the promotion process within DepEd is hindered by delays, excessive requirements, and limited higher positions. Chapter 6 of the DBM Manual restricts Master Teachers in elementary schools to 10% of the staff, with specific ratios for Master Teachers I and II.

Table 4. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of teaching experience

Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1-10	64	50.8
11-20	26	20.6
21-30	28	22.2
31-40	8	6.3
Total	126	100.0

Table 4 shows the teaching experience of survey respondents. The largest group has 1-10 years of experience, with 64 respondents (50.8%). The next largest group has 21-30 years of experience, comprising 28 respondents (22.2%). Those with 11-20 years of experience include 26 respondents (20.6%). Eight respondents (6.3%) have 31-40 years of experience. This clearly shows that many of the elementary teachers in the district have relatively young teaching experience. However, it is essential to note that this does not imply any lack of competence in their profession. Contrary to the notion that novice teachers might be less proficient, various studies offer limited support for this claim (Graham et al., 2020).

Table 5 shows the educational attainment of survey respondents, categorized into five groups. The largest group holds a "master's degree with units," with 52 respondents (41.3%). The second largest group has a "bachelor's degree," with 40 respondents (31.7%). "Master's degree graduates" comprise 29 respondents (23.0%). A small

percentage have a "Doctorate Degree with units" (3.2%), with four respondents, and only one respondent (0.8%) has completed a "Doctorate Degree."

Table 5. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of educational attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Bachelor Degree	40	31.7
Master's Degree with units	52	41.3
Master's Degree Graduate	29	23.0
Doctorate Degree with units	4	3.2
Doctorate Degree Graduate	1	0.8
Total	126	100.0

The data indicates that many participants pursue graduate degrees to enhance their skills and qualifications. The DepEd encourages this to promote career advancement (Sarabia, 2020). Abellana and Abadiano (2020) state that teachers pursue graduate education to improve teaching competence, advance positions, and foster self-confidence and self-fulfillment, benefiting the working environment and learner achievement. However, only a few have advanced to the Ph.D. level, likely due to the significant time, financial resources, and access to educational opportunities required (Amutabi, 2018).

3.2 Teachers' Level of Self-efficacy

Table 6. Consolidated findings of the respondents' level of self-efficacy

Self-efficacy	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Efficacy in Student Engagement	3.49	0.45	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.33	0.45	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.35	0.49	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
Total Measure	3.39	0.41	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy

Table 6 indicates a consistently very high level of self-efficacy across all three dimensions. The total measure has a mean of 3.39, reinforcing the respondents' overall very high self-efficacy across these areas. Tschannen-Moran et al. (2007) stated that teachers with high self-efficacy are likelier to handle classroom dynamics skillfully. The teachers in the study exhibited expert management of classroom dynamics as they demonstrated very high levels of self-efficacy in controlling disruptive behavior, ensuring learners adhere to rules, calming disruptive pupils, and establishing effective classroom management systems. This means that despite the different characters and attitudes of each pupil, the teachers were able to manage them in class.

The respondents' high self-efficacy in student engagement suggests that they can effectively motivate and inspire pupils lacking interest in school. Their proficiency in this area indicates they are skilled at fostering an environment where students perform well academically and develop a genuine appreciation for learning. Halim and Ahmad (2015) support this notion, stating that teachers with a strong belief in their capabilities are inclined to positively impact student behavior and academic performance. Furthermore, the respondents' high self-efficacy in instructional strategies implies that teachers can provide alternative explanations when pupils encounter confusion and are proficient in implementing diverse teaching approaches in the classroom. Lazarides and Warner (2020) further agree with this notion, stating that teachers with high self-efficacy are more open to new methods, set challenging goals, plan well, tackle problems, and adjust strategies when needed.

3.3 Teachers' Level of Stress

Table 7. Consolidated findings of the respondents' assessment of the level of teachers' stress

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Workload	3.08	0.52	Agree	Moderately Stressed
Student Behavior	2.94	0.52	Agree	Moderately Stressed
Instrumental Support	2.48	0.62	Disagree	Low Stress
Total Measure	2.83	0.44	Agree	Moderately Stressed

Table 7 reveals a pattern of moderate stress in workload (Mean=3.08) and student behavior (Mean=2.94), and instrumental support (Mean=2.48) is associated with lower stress levels. The total measure (Mean= 2.83, SD= 0.44), describes the moderately stressed educators. This result suggests that teachers, on average, experience moderate

levels of stress in their roles. This result aligned with the study by Agai-Demjaha et al. (2015), which found that teachers experienced moderate stress in their work. The results implied that the educators are moderately stressed due to workload and student behavior but experience relatively low stress levels related to instrumental support. It suggested that while some aspects of their job create stress, such as managing workload and student behavior, instrumental support from colleagues and administrators contributes to mitigating overall stress levels.

This finding is supported by the study of Gustafson (2015), which proposed that enhancing the collaborative capacity of the teaching profession through organizational changes at both district and school levels has the potential to effectively reduce the stress experienced by teachers. This is because when teachers collaborate more with their colleagues and administrators, it helps them address problems such as workload and student behavior. Notably, teachers who receive adequate instrumental support experience relatively low-stress levels. On the other hand, regardless of whether teacher respondents report relatively moderate stress levels because of workload, it is still critical to address workload-related stress. This is critical not just for the well-being of teachers but also for maximizing the overall effectiveness of the educational system. Furthermore, teachers' frequent exposure to poor student behaviors without assistance or solutions might cause higher stress over time. According to Zedan (2012), disruptive behavior among learners increases teacher stress, which can harm classrooms.

3.4 Teachers' Level of Work Commitment

Table 8. Consolidated findings of the respondents' level of work commitment

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Commitment to students	3.46	0.51	Strongly Agree	Highly Committed
Commitment to teaching	3.20	0.51	Agree	Moderately Committed
Commitment to school	2.90	0.54	Agree	Moderately Committed
Commitment to profession	2.70	0.62	Agree	Moderately Committed
Total Measure	3.06	0.39	Agree	Moderately Committed

Table 8 indicates a range of commitment levels across these dimensions. The commitment to students is notably high (Mean=3.46, SD=0.51), signifying a highly committed stance. In contrast, the commitment to teaching (Mean=3.20, SD=0.51), commitment to the school (Mean=2.90, SD=0.54), and commitment to the teaching profession (Mean=2.70, SD=0.62) signify a moderately committed stance overall. The total measure supports the conclusion of a moderately committed stance overall. The result is consistent with Altun's (2017) study, which found that committed teachers exhibit a genuine interest in their students' improvement and actively engage in various teaching methods to improve learning efficiency. Committed educators focus on making meaningful connections with students, maintaining respectful relationships, and creating an environment conducive to learning. Overall, teachers display a significant commitment to their students, teaching, and the teaching profession, and they generally find value in their work.

3.5 Teachers' Level of Intention to Stay

Table 9. Consolidated findings of the level of teachers' intention to stay

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
School Leadership	3.32	0.48	Strongly Agree	Very High Intention to Stay
Teaching Support	3.14	0.44	Agree	High Intention to Stay
Workload	2.46	0.65	Disagree	Low Intention to Stay
Career Development	3.00	0.52	Agree	High Intention to Stay
Compensation and Benefits	2.50	0.71	Disagree	Low Intention to Stay
Total Measure	2.88	0.42	Agree	High Intention to Stay

Table 9 shows that school leadership stands out with a high intention to stay (Mean=3.32, SD=0.48) while teaching support also reflects a high intention to stay (Mean=3.14, SD=0.44). The results revealed a range of intention to stay levels across Career development (Mean=3.00, SD=0.52), indicating a high intention to stay. On the other hand, workload (Mean=2.46) and compensation and benefits (Mean=2.50) both show a low intention to stay. The total measure, however, reflects an overall high intention to stay, with a mean of 2.88 and a standard deviation of 0.42. The results emphasized school leadership and teaching support's crucial role in fostering a high intention to stay among educators. This notion aligns with previous studies indicating that enhancing school leadership,

fostering positive teacher relationships, and principal support contribute to higher teacher retention (Hughes et al., 2014; Kraft et al., 2016).

On the other hand, one of the striking findings in the results is the challenges related to workload, compensation, and benefits. These challenges significantly impact educators' intention to stay, leading to low intention in these areas. The demanding nature of their responsibilities characterizes the workload of Filipino public school teachers, as they are focused on enhancing instruction and burdened with excessive extraneous tasks. Despite numerous studies addressing these challenges and repeated calls for action, this issue remains one of the most pressing in education (Tarraya, 2023). It is apparent that completely resolving this issue will require significant time and effort, and teachers can only hope for the best. In terms of compensation, teachers may need more than salaries to compensate them for the intense workload they endure. Ismael et al. (2021) further highlighted the inconsistency between teachers' commendable efforts and their insufficient compensation. Anderson (2022) also argued that raising salaries and providing attractive incentives is vital for attracting and retaining high-quality educators. Therefore, while resolving this issue may require long-term commitment and budget adjustments, the long-term benefits are undeniable.

3.6 Teachers' Self-Efficacy When Grouped According to Demographics

Table 10 shows the test results comparing teachers' self-efficacy across age groups in three dimensions. No significant differences were found in student engagement ($F=1.807$, $p=0.149$) and instructional strategies ($F=1.307$, $p=0.275$), suggesting similar confidence levels among teachers of different ages.

Table 10. Test of difference in teachers' self-efficacy when grouped according to their age

Teachers' Self-Efficacy	Age Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	20-29 (n=13)	30-39 (n=46)	40-49 (n=37)	50-65 (n=30)			
Efficacy in Student Engagement	3.37 (.56)	3.41 (.49)	3.52 (.39)	3.63 (.35)	1.807 (.149)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.25 (.42)	3.25 (.49)	3.36 (.41)	3.44 (.42)	1.307 (.275)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.29 ^{ab} (.38)	3.16 ^a (.49)	3.48 ^b (.48)	3.51 ^b (.45)	4.632** (.004)	Significant	Reject Ho
Total Measure	3.30 (.42)	3.28 (.44)	3.45 (.38)	3.53 (.35)	2.903* (.038)	Significant	Reject Ho

Note: **significant ($p<.01$), *significant ($p<.05$), ^{ab}based on Duncan test

However, a notable finding emerges in the dimension of efficacy in classroom management, where a significant difference is evident ($F=4.632$, $p=0.004$). A post hoc Duncan test reveals that teachers in the age group 50-65 (Mean=3.51) exhibit significantly higher efficacy in classroom management compared to those in the 30-39 age group ($p<0.05$). The total measure of teachers' self-efficacy also demonstrates a significant difference among age groups ($F=2.903$, $p=0.038$). Thus, age significantly affects the teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management but not their efficacy in student engagement and instructional strategies.

In the teacher-respondents' context, older teachers have gained experience dealing with challenging students and managing larger classes. As a result, they display greater confidence in managing their classes. Moreover, they develop a deeper understanding of their strengths and weaknesses and ample opportunities to refine their classroom management strategies over time. This idea finds support in the studies conducted by Aloka and Bojuwoye (2013) and Ünal and Ünal (2012), both of which indicate that older teachers excel in managing student disciplinary issues and are more effective in teaching and managing classrooms compared to their younger counterparts.

Table 11 presents the results of a test examining the differences in teachers' self-efficacy based on gender. The results revealed no significant differences in self-efficacy between male and female teachers. Specifically, for efficacy in student engagement ($t=1.484$, $p=0.140$), instructional strategies ($t=1.340$, $p=0.183$), classroom management ($t=0.863$, $p=0.390$), and the total self-efficacy measure ($t=1.368$, $p=0.174$), no statistically significant variations were observed between the male and female groups. Thus, gender has no significant difference in teachers' efficacy.

Table 11. Test of difference in teachers' self-efficacy when grouped according to their gender

Teachers' Self-Efficacy	Gender Group		t-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	Male (n=20)	Female (n=106)			
Efficacy in Student Engagement	3.63 (.40)	3.46 (.45)	1.484 (.140)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.45 (.38)	3.30 (.46)	1.340 (.183)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.44 (.47)	3.33 (.49)	.863 (.390)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	3.50 (.37)	3.37 (.41)	1.368 (.174)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant ($p > .05$)

This result aligns with Rani and Jain (2023), who found no significant difference between male and female teachers' self-efficacy. These findings suggest that gender does not influence teachers' perceptions of their teaching skills and competence. This observation reflects what can be seen locally, where stereotypes do not constrain both male and female teachers and are confident in their tasks regardless of their gender. It demonstrates a positive shift from traditional gender biases towards a more inclusive teaching environment where all teachers feel empowered to excel.

Table 12 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' self-efficacy based on their position within the educational hierarchy.

Table 12. Test of difference in teachers' self-efficacy when grouped according to their position

Teachers' Self-Efficacy	Position Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	Teacher 1 (n=77)	Teacher 2 (n=9)	Teacher 3 (n=29)	Master Teacher (n=11)			
Efficacy in Student Engagement	3.47 ^b (.46)	3.11 ^a (.49)	3.57 ^b (.39)	3.73 ^b (.26)	3.802* (.012)	Significant	Reject Ho
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.31 ^a (.41)	3.08 ^a (.52)	3.34 ^a (.49)	3.66 ^b (.41)	3.122* (.028)	Significant	Reject Ho
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.32 ^{ab} (.47)	3.03 ^a (.42)	3.38 ^b (.52)	3.77 ^c (.33)	4.583** (.004)	Significant	Reject Ho
Total Measure	3.36^b (.39)	3.07^a (.45)	3.43^b (.42)	3.72^c (.26)	4.724** (.004)	Significant	Reject Ho

Note: **significant ($p < .01$), *significant ($p < .05$), ^{abc}based on Duncan test

The study found significant differences in teachers' self-efficacy across positions, with Master Teachers exhibiting higher levels of self-efficacy than teachers in other positions. Specifically, Master Teachers reported significantly higher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management, and the total measure of self-efficacy. These findings suggest that Master Teachers have higher self-efficacy in various aspects of teaching, which may be attributed to their experience and expertise in managing classrooms, engaging students, and implementing effective instructional strategies. The extent of their tasks significantly impacts their confidence levels, aligning with Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, which emphasizes the role of experience in building self-efficacy. Huang and Yin (2018) noted that higher-ranking teachers have greater job satisfaction and efficacy. Recognizing and nurturing the strengths of educators at various career stages is crucial. The Department of Education supports this by having Master Teachers mentor less experienced teachers, fostering their growth and effectiveness.

Table 13. Test of difference in teachers' self-efficacy when grouped according to their teaching experience

Teachers' Self-Efficacy	Teaching Experience Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	1-10 (n=64)	11-20 (n=26)	21-30 (n=28)	31-40 (n=8)			
Efficacy in Student Engagement	3.45 (.50)	3.55 (.40)	3.52 (.39)	3.56 (.35)	0.463 (.709)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.30 (.46)	3.27 (.45)	3.43 (.46)	3.38 (.33)	0.724 (.540)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.27 (.47)	3.38 (.53)	3.46 (.48)	3.53 (.41)	1.506 (.216)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	3.34 (.43)	3.40 (.40)	3.47 (.39)	3.49 (.33)	.851 (.469)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant ($p > .05$)

Table 13 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' self-efficacy based on their teaching experience. The results show no significant differences in teachers' self-efficacy across different teaching experience groups. There were no statistically significant variations in efficacy for student engagement ($F=0.463$, $p=0.709$), instructional strategies ($F=0.724$, $p=0.540$), classroom management ($F=1.506$, $p=0.216$), or overall self-efficacy ($F=0.851$, $p=0.469$). This suggests that years of teaching experience do not significantly affect self-efficacy in these areas within the sample studied.

Table 14. Test of difference in teachers' self-efficacy when grouped according to their educational attainment

Teachers' Self-Efficacy	Educational Attainment Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	Bachelor (n=40)	Master degree with units (n=52)	Master degree Graduate (n=29)	Doctoral Level (n=5)			
Efficacy in Student Engagement	3.46 (.47)	3.44 (.47)	3.57 (.37)	3.75 (.43)	1.125 (.342)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.33 (.47)	3.31 (.41)	3.30 (.48)	3.70 (.45)	1.227 (.303)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.34 (.49)	3.32 (.49)	3.38 (.50)	3.55 (.51)	.369 (.775)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	3.38 (.43)	3.36 (.41)	3.42 (.39)	3.67 (.44)	.922 (.433)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant ($p>.05$)

Table 14 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' self-efficacy based on their educational attainment. The results indicate no significant differences in teachers' self-efficacy across the different educational attainment groups. For efficacy in student engagement ($F=1.125$, $p=0.342$), instructional strategies ($F=1.227$, $p=0.303$), classroom management ($F=0.369$, $p=0.775$), and the total measure of self-efficacy ($F=0.922$, $p=0.433$), no statistically significant variations were observed. Thus, educational attainment has no significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy.

These findings indicate that educational background does not significantly impact teachers' confidence in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. This implies that pursuing higher education may not necessarily correlate with significant teacher self-efficacy differences. However, Abun et al. (2021) suggest that higher educational attainment can improve self-efficacy by enhancing teaching skills. Overall, significant differences in self-efficacy are observed by age and position but not by gender, teaching experience, or educational attainment, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis regarding age and position.

3.7 Teachers' Stress When Grouped According to Demographics

Table 15. Test of difference in teachers' stress when grouped according to their age

Teachers' Stress	Age Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	20-29 (n=13)	30-39 (n=46)	40-49 (n=37)	50-65 (n=30)			
Workload	2.96 (.50)	3.17 (.45)	2.94 (.55)	3.17 (.55)	1.973 (.122)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Student Behavior	2.68 (.50)	3.04 (.45)	2.95 (.52)	2.86 (.62)	2.002 (.117)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	2.47 (.53)	2.50 (.65)	2.34 (.62)	2.63 (.60)	1.368 (.289)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	2.70 (.45)	2.90 (.39)	2.75 (.44)	2.89 (.47)	1.526 (.211)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant means $p\text{-value} > .05$ (no statistical difference)

Table 15 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' stress based on their age group. The results indicate no significant differences in teachers' stress across the different age groups. For workload ($F=1.973$, $p=0.122$), student behavior ($F=2.002$, $p=0.117$), instrumental support ($F=1.368$, $p=0.289$), and the total measure of stress ($F=1.526$, $p=0.211$), no statistically significant variations were observed. Thus, age has no significant difference in teachers' stress. These findings suggest that teachers of different age groups experience similar stress levels related to workload, student behavior, and instrumental support. Therefore, the lack of significant differences implies that age may not be a determining factor in the stress levels reported by teachers.

Table 16. Test of difference in teachers' stress when grouped according to their gender

Teachers' Stress	Gender Group		t-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	Male (n=20)	Female (n=106)			
Workload	3.06 (.39)	3.08 (.54)	-.164 (.870)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Student Behavior	3.08 (.51)	2.91 (.53)	1.303 (.195)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	2.61 (.62)	2.46 (.62)	.975 (.332)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	2.92 (.36)	2.82 (.45)	.920 (.359)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant means p-value > .05 (no statistical difference)

Table 16 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' stress based on gender. The results indicate no significant differences in teachers' stress between male and female groups. For workload ($t=-0.164$, $p=0.870$), student behavior ($t=1.303$, $p=0.195$), instrumental support ($t=0.975$, $p=0.332$), and the total measure of stress ($t=0.920$, $p=0.359$), no statistically significant variations were observed. Thus, gender has no significant difference in teachers' stress. These findings suggest that male and female teachers experience similar stress levels related to workload, student behavior, and support. This aligns with the study by Mahmood et al. (2022), which found no significant gender differences in teachers' stress.

Table 17. Test of difference in teachers' stress when grouped according to their position

Teachers' Stress	Position Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	Teacher 1 (n=77)	Teacher 2 (n=9)	Teacher 3 (n=29)	Master Teacher (n=11)			
Workload	3.03 (.50)	3.19 (.31)	3.15 (.57)	3.19 (.59)	.791 (.501)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Student Behavior	2.91 (.47)	3.03 (.56)	3.00 (.56)	2.90 (.55)	.317 (.813)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	2.36 (.60)	2.78 (.44)	2.71 (.61)	2.49 (.72)	3.185* (.026)	Significant	Reject Ho
Total Measure	2.77 (.39)	3.00 (.33)	2.96 (.55)	2.86 (.45)	1.877 (.137)	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: *significant ($p<.05$)

Table 17 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' stress based on their position. The results indicate a significant difference in teachers' stress based on their position for instrumental support ($F=3.185$, $p=0.026$). However, no significant differences were found for workload ($F=0.791$, $p=0.501$), student behavior ($F=0.317$, $p=0.813$), and the total measure of stress ($F=1.877$, $p=0.137$). Thus, teachers' stress has no significant difference when grouped according to demographic profile. These findings suggest that while stress levels regarding instrumental support differ significantly by position, overall stress related to workload and student behavior is similar across Teacher 1, Teacher 2, Teacher 3, and Master Teachers. Teacher 2 reports the highest stress regarding instrumental support (Mean=2.78), indicating they may struggle to access necessary resources and support for their teaching duties. In contrast, Master Teachers exhibited the lowest stress levels overall, likely benefiting from more extensive training and support systems that help them manage their responsibilities more effectively.

Table 18. Test of difference in teachers' stress when grouped according to their teaching experience

Teachers' Stress	Teaching Experience Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	1-10 (n=64)	11-20 (n=26)	21-30 (n=28)	31-40 (n=8)			
Workload	3.05 (.50)	3.14 (.49)	3.08 (.55)	3.18 (.64)	.310 (.818)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Student Behavior	2.92 (.49)	3.04 (.44)	2.89 (.58)	2.91 (.84)	.420 (.739)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	2.39 (.62)	2.41 (.61)	2.65 (.59)	2.89 (.59)	2.512 (.062)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	2.79 (.41)	2.86 (.36)	2.87 (.48)	2.99 (.67)	.705 (.551)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant ($p>.05$)

Table 18 displays the results of a test examining differences in teachers' stress based on their teaching experience. The findings revealed that there are no significant differences in teachers' stress based on their teaching experience for any of the dimensions measured: workload ($F=0.310$, $p=0.818$), student behavior ($F=0.420$, $p=0.739$), instrumental support ($F=2.512$, $p=0.062$), and the total measure of stress ($F=0.705$, $p=0.551$). Thus, teaching experience has no significant difference to teachers' stress. The findings suggest that teachers' stress levels do not significantly vary based on their years of teaching experience. Factors such as integrating technology, adapting to changing curricula, and meeting the needs of diverse students may contribute more substantially to stress levels. Despite differences in experience, teachers may encounter similar challenges, resulting in comparable stress levels.

Table 19. Test of difference in teachers' stress when grouped according to their educational attainment

Teachers' Stress	Educational Attainment Group				F-value (p-value)	Remarks	Decision
	Bachelor (n=40)	Master degree with units (n=52)	Master degree Graduate (n=29)	Doctoral Level (n=5)			
Workload	3.05 (.41)	3.07 (.55)	3.16 (.58)	3.06 (.64)	.316 (.814)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Student Behavior	2.93 (.49)	2.85 (.56)	3.11 (.47)	2.94 (.59)	1.580 (.198)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	2.33 (.61)	2.63 (.62)	2.39 (.60)	2.80 (.48)	2.532 (.060)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Total Measure	2.77 (.34)	2.85 (.50)	2.89 (.44)	2.93 (.32)	.579 (.630)	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: not significant ($p > .05$)

Table 19 presents the results of a test examining differences in teachers' stress based on their educational attainment. The findings indicate that there are no significant differences in teachers' stress based on their educational attainment for any of the dimensions measured: workload ($F=0.316$, $p=0.814$), student behavior ($F=1.580$, $p=0.198$), instrumental support ($F=2.532$, $p=0.060$), and the total measure of stress ($F=0.579$, $p=0.630$). Thus, educational attainment has no significant difference in teachers' stress. These results suggest that teachers' stress levels do not significantly vary by educational attainment. Factors beyond academic qualifications, such as coping mechanisms, may influence stress more prominently. Galanakis et al. (2020) found that teachers with postgraduate degrees might experience less stress, but stress management is not typically included in graduate programs.

Overall, demographic factors like age, gender, position, teaching experience, or educational attainment do not significantly impact perceived stress levels, highlighting the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing teacher stress.

3.8 Influence of Teachers' Self-Efficacy on Teachers' Work Commitment

Table 20. Stepwise regression analysis of teachers' work commitment on self-efficacy predictors

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
(Constant)	2.277	0.268	8.506	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Student Engagement	0.226	0.076	2.966**	.004	Significant	Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .059$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=8.798^{**}$, $p=.004$, ** -significant at .01 level

Excluded Predictors: Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management

Fitted Regression Model: $Y = 2.277 + .226 \times \text{student engagement}$

Table 20 displays the regression analysis results examining the impact of teachers' self-efficacy on their work commitment. The analysis revealed significant insights into the relationships between these variables. The model includes a statistically significant constant term of 2.277 ($t=8.506$, $p=.000$), indicating a baseline level of work commitment when other predictors are zero. The predictor "teachers' efficacy in student engagement" emerges as significant ($\beta=.226$, $t=2.966$, $p=.004$), indicating that when teachers feel confident in engaging students effectively, their work commitment tends to be higher. This aligns with Miller (2020), who found teacher self-efficacy in student engagement to predict commitment significantly.

The overall model's R-squared value of .059 suggests that the included predictors explain approximately 5.9% of the variance in teachers' work commitment, confirmed by the significant ANOVA for regression ($F=8.798$, $p=.004$), rejecting the null hypothesis. The regression equation, $Y = 2.277 + .226 \times \text{Efficacy in Student Engagement}$, implies that for every unit increase in teachers' efficacy in student engagement, there is an expected increase of 0.226 units in their work commitment, holding other variables constant. In the context of respondents, confidence in effectively engaging students may stem from training workshops and educational programs by DepEd, covering topics like student engagement and new teaching trends. These efforts reflect teachers' strong commitment to acquiring skills necessary for effective student engagement, contributing to their commitment to the profession.

3.9 Influence of Teachers' Stress on Work Commitment

Table 21. Simultaneous regression analysis of teachers' work commitment on teachers' stress predictors

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
(Constant)	1.840	0.209	8.799	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Workload	0.161	0.073	2.205	.029	Significant	Reject Ho
Student Behavior	0.095	0.076	1.249	.214	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	0.181	0.055	3.278***	.001	Significant	Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .224$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=13.043^{***}$, $p=.000$. ***-significant at .001 level

Teacher Work Commitment (Y) – dependent variable

Excluded Predictor: Student Behavior

Fitted Regression Model: $Y = 1.840 + .161*Workload + .181*Instrumental\ support$

Table 21 presents the regression analysis, which identified workload and instrumental support as significant predictors of teachers' work commitment, with coefficients of .161 ($p = .029$) and .181 ($p = .001$), respectively. Student behavior did not significantly predict work commitment ($p = .214$). The model explained 22.4% of the variance in work commitment.

The ANOVA for regression further confirms the model's significance ($F=13.043$, $p=.000$). The fitted regression equation is $Y = 1.840 + .161Workload + .181Instrumental\ Support$. It means that the initial level of work commitment is 1.840. As teachers' workload stress increases by one unit, their work commitment is predicted to increase by 0.161 units. Likewise, their work commitment is predicted to increase by 0.181 units for every one-unit increase in instrumental support. Therefore, this implies that higher levels of workload and instrumental support are associated with higher levels of work commitment.

This result contradicts the findings of Laily and Wahyuni (2023), who revealed that as job stress increases, teachers' level of commitment tends to decrease. However, the teachers in this study perceived an increased workload as a reflection of their abilities and contributions to their profession, which led to increased commitment as they strived to meet their demands. The key informant interviews revealed that teachers view workload as a trigger that brings out their talents, skills, and resourcefulness, as well as an opportunity for professional growth and learning. Deadlines and responsibilities were also seen as factors that make teachers highly productive and focused, with time management being a key coping mechanism.

These findings highlight the importance of managing workload and providing instrumental support to enhance teachers' work commitment. However, it is essential to acknowledge the study's limitations and the context of the findings, as they may not be generalizable to all teaching contexts. Further research in diverse settings is needed to validate and contextualize these results.

3.10 Influence of Teachers' Demographics on Work Commitment

Table 22 displays the regression analysis results examining the influence of demographic profiles on teachers' work commitment. The model's R-squared value of 0.189 indicates that these demographic variables can explain approximately 18.9% of the variance in work commitment. The ANOVA test for regression was significant ($F=2.01$, $p=0.026$), indicating that the regression model is statistically significant in predicting work commitment. Furthermore, the regression analysis reveals a significant effect of gender on work commitment, with female teachers showing lower commitment than male counterparts ($B = -0.259$, $t = -2.702$, $p = 0.008$).

This aligns with the findings of Korso (2013), who reported higher professional commitment among male teachers. However, these results contradict the study by Islam et al. (2012), which found female teachers to have higher levels of commitment. Moreover, teaching experience was also found to significantly impact work commitment, with teachers having 31-40 years of experience exhibiting higher levels of commitment. This is consistent with the study by Agrawal and Jain (2020), which suggested that longer service in the teaching profession leads to stronger emotional attachment and commitment to the school. At the same time, the results showed that age, position, and educational attainment did not significantly impact teachers' work commitment.

Table 22. Regression analysis of teachers' work commitment on teachers' demographic profiles

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
Age						
20-29	Ref	--	--	--	--	
30-39	.071	.119	.592	.555	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
40-49	.133	.140	.951	.344	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
50-65	.114	.180	.636	.526	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Gender						
Male	Ref	--	--	--	--	
Female	-.259	.096	-2.702**	.008	Significant	Reject Ho
Position						
Teacher 1	Ref	--	--	--	--	
Teacher 2	-.127	.136	-.930	.354	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Teacher 3	-.018	.114	-.162	.872	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Master teacher	-.046	.163	-.281	.779	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Teaching Experience						
1-10	Ref	--	--	--	--	
11-20	.168	.118	1.418	.159	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
21-30	.225	.141	1.595	.113	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
31-40	.492	.191	2.580*	.011	Significant	Reject Ho
Educational Attainment						
Bachelor degree	Ref	--	--	--	--	
Master Degree with units	.086	.085	1.012	.314	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Master Degree Graduate	.132	.100	1.312	.192	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Doctorate level	.246	.190	1.294	.198	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .189$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=2.01^*$, $p=.026$ **-significant at .01 level

*-significant at .05 level

3.11 Influence of Teachers' Self-efficacy on Intention to Stay

Table 23 indicates that efficacy in "student engagement" significantly contributed to teachers' intention to stay, with a coefficient of .361 ($t= 3.097$, $p= .002$). This means that as teachers' confidence in their ability to engage students increases, their likelihood of staying in the teaching profession also increases.

Table 23. Simultaneous regression analysis of teachers' intention to stay on teachers' self-efficacy predictors

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
(Constant)	1.528	.291	5.259	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Student Engagement	.361	.117	3.097**	.002	Significant	Reject Ho
Instructional strategies	-.002	.117	-0.020	.984	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Classroom Management	.031	.107	0.288	.774	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .147$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=8.205^{***}$, $p=.000$. **-significant at .01 level

Teacher Intention to Stay (Y) – dependent variable

Fitted Regression Model: $Y = 1.528 + .361 \times \text{student engagement}$

The overall model's goodness of fit was represented by the R-squared value of .147, indicating that the included predictors can explain approximately 14.7% of the variance in teachers' intention to stay. The ANOVA for regression further confirmed the model's significance ($F=8.205$, $p=.000$). The findings suggest teachers tend to stay in their roles when they can actively engage their learners in the learning process, which brings them a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment. Conversely, when teachers struggle to engage their learners, they may become disheartened and unmotivated in their jobs, exhibiting a negative attitude towards teaching, which could lead to leaving their positions.

3.12 Influence of Teachers' Stress on Intention to Stay

Table 24 presents the simultaneous regression analysis of teachers' intention to stay on teachers' stress predictors, which reveals the limited explanatory power of the model. The model included a significant constant term of 3.071 ($t=12.087$, $p=.000$), indicating a baseline intention to stay when other predictors are zero. However, none of the stress-related predictors, including "workload," "student behavior," and "instrumental support," demonstrated statistically significant effects on teachers' intention to stay. The overall model's goodness of fit was reflected in the R-squared value of .019, suggesting that only 1.9% of the variance in teachers' intention to stay could be

explained by the included predictors. The ANOVA for regression further confirmed the lack of significance ($F=.784$, $p=.505$).

Table 24. Simultaneous regression analysis of teachers' intention to stay on teachers' stress

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
(Constant)	3.071	.254	12.087	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Workload	.060	.089	.678	.499	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Student Behavior	-.072	.093	-.775	.440	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Instrumental Support	-.065	.067	-.974	.332	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .019$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=.784$, $p=.505$ not significant at .05 level

These findings suggest that, in this context, teachers' intention to stay is not substantially influenced by the specified stress-related factors. The teachers in this study may exhibit effective coping mechanisms for stress, thereby minimizing its influence on their intention to stay. Research indicates that teachers frequently utilize coping strategies to manage stress and negative emotions, and they may perceive stress as an opportunity for personal growth rather than a reason to quit.

3.13 Influence of Teachers' Demographics on Intention to Stay

Table 25 revealed that no demographic factors significantly influenced teachers' commitment to remain in their current teaching positions. Age, gender, teaching position, teaching experience, and educational attainment were not significant predictors of teachers' intention to stay. Moreover, the study highlighted that the model's explanatory power was relatively low ($R^2 = .102$), suggesting that the examined variables explained only a small portion of the variance in teachers' intention to stay at work. Additionally, the ANOVA for Regression revealed that the overall regression model was insignificant ($F = .982$, $p = .474$), indicating that the included variables collectively did not significantly predict teachers' intention to stay at work.

Table 25. Regression analysis of teachers' intention to stay at work on teachers' demographic profiles

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
Age						
20-29	Ref	--	--	--	--	
30-39	-.095	.134	-.708	.480	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
40-49	.148	.158	.937	.351	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
50-65	.123	.202	.610	.543	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Gender						
Male	Ref	--	--	--	--	
Female	-.075	.108	-.696	.488	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Position						
Teacher 1	Ref	--	--	--	--	
Teacher 2	-.177	.153	-1.157	.250	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Teacher 3	.009	.128	.070	.944	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Master teacher	-.200	.184	-1.091	.278	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Teaching Experience						
1-10	Ref	--	--	--	--	
11-20	-.050	.133	-.374	.709	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
21-30	-.056	.159	-.352	.726	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
31-40	.234	.214	1.090	.278	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Educational Attainment						
Bachelor degree	Ref	--	--	--	--	
Master Degree with units	.025	.096	.264	.793	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Master Degree Graduate	.024	.113	.213	.832	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Doctorate level	.002	.214	.008	.994	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .102$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=.982$, $p=.474$ not significant at .05 level

3.14 Influence of Teachers' Work Commitment on Intention to Stay

Table 26 revealed that among the work commitment dimensions, "commitment to students" and "commitment to school" were identified as significant contributors to teachers' intention to stay, with coefficients of .221 ($t=2.915$, $p=.004$) and .229 ($t=2.990$, $p=.003$), respectively. This suggests that as "commitment to students" and "commitment to school" increase, teachers' intention to stay also increases. However, "commitment to teaching" and "commitment to the profession" did not significantly predict teachers' intention to stay in this model. The overall

model's goodness of fit, reflected in the R-squared value of .165, indicates that the included predictors can explain approximately 16.5% of the variance in teachers' intention to stay. The ANOVA for regression further confirmed the model's significance ($F=7.176$, $p=.000$).

Table 26. Simultaneous regression analysis of teachers' intention to stay on work commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t-value	p-value	Remark	Decision
	B	S. E.				
(Constant)	1.737	.280	6.208	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Commitment to Students	.221	.076	2.915**	.004	Significant	Reject Ho
Commitment to Teaching	-.011	.081	-.141	.888	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Commitment to school	.229	.077	2.990**	.003	Significant	Reject Ho
Commitment to profession	-.092	.060	-1.539	.126	Not significant	Fail to Reject Ho

Note: $R^2 = .165$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=7.176^{***}$, $p=.000$. ***-significant at .001 level

Fitted Regression Model: $Y = 1.737 + .221 \times \text{commitment to students} + .229 \times \text{commitment to school}$

In the study context, it was evident that teachers' commitment to their students and the school significantly impacts their professional decisions. On the other hand, a lack of commitment among teachers can potentially encourage them to consider changing occupations (Räsänen et al., 2020).

4.0 Conclusion

In light of the findings, it can be concluded that teachers feel confident in their abilities and are committed to their students, even though they face moderate stress and have a strong desire to stay in their jobs. Interestingly, how confident teachers feel can vary with their age and gender, but stress levels do not change much based on these factors. It turns out that teachers who are good at engaging students are also more dedicated to their work. Also, factors like stress from too much work and the support they get can predict how committed they are to their jobs. Even when teachers are stressed, they still want to keep teaching, especially if they feel confident about connecting with students. However, stress does not seem to affect their decision to stay or leave or their age, gender, or other personal details. Teachers who care about their students and feel connected to their school are likelier to stick with their jobs. The study suggests that it is important to have programs that help teachers feel better and more invested in their work. These programs should help teachers build confidence, deal with stress, and strengthen their bond with students and the school. In doing so, we can create a better environment for teachers, helping them excel in their crucial role in education.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

Miss Borres was responsible for the study's conception and design. She conducted the data analysis, wrote the initial draft of the manuscript, and coordinated the overall project. Mr. Potane contributed to the study design and provided critical revisions and intellectual input, significantly enhancing the final manuscript.

6.0 Funding

This work received no specific grant from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest about the publication of this paper

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researcher thanks the Almighty God for wisdom and guidance throughout the study. Special thanks to Dr. Joel D. Potane for their invaluable support and mentorship. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Edwin C. Du, Dr. Olga C. Alonsabe, Dr. Mercelita J. Labial, Dr. Warren Luzano, and Dr. Peter Xenos. To the Division of Bukidnon for allowing me to conduct the study. Gratitude to Dr. Geldolin Inte, Dr. Josephine O. Oted, and Dr. Irene C. Quimbo for validating the research instrument. Special appreciation goes to her relatives, who supported the researcher throughout the study. Lastly, the researcher would like to thank her family — Papa Maning, Mama Chona, Chin, and Jr — for their unconditional love and support.

9.0 References

- Abellana, J.M., & Abadiano, M.N. (2020). The mindset of teachers in pursuing graduate education: A grounded theory. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(15). <https://www.jcreview.com/paper.php?slug=the-mindset-of-teachers-in-pursuing-graduate-education-a-grounded-theory>
- Abun, D., Asuncion, S., Lazaro, J., Magallanes, T., & Catbagan, N. (2021). The effect of educational attainment, length of work experience on the self-efficacy of teachers and employees. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3954135>
- Agai-Demjaha, T., Bislimovska, J. K., & Mijakoski, D. (2015). Level of work related stress among teachers in elementary schools. *Open access Macedonian journal of medical sciences*, 3(3), 484–488. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.076>
- Agyapong, B., Obuobi-Donkor, G., Burbach, L., & Wei, Y. (2022). Stress, burnout, anxiety and depression among teachers: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(17), 10706. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710706>
- Agrawal, S., & Jain, B. K. (2020). Influence of demographic variables on organizational commitment of school teachers: Evidence from the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 262-274. <https://doi.org/10.3126/qjms.v2i2.33298>
- Aloka, P. J., & Bojuwoye, O. (2013). Gender, age and teaching experiences differences in decision-making behaviours of members of selected Kenyan secondary school disciplinary panels. *Asian Social Sciences*, 9(10). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n10p43>
- Altun, M. (2017). The effects of teacher commitment on student achievement: A case study in Iraq. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(11), 417-426. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbs/v7-i11/3475>

- Amutabi, M. N. (2018). Social and political obstacles in pursuing PhD degree in Africa: Interrogating the problem of gatekeepers and structural obstacles. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2 (1), 126-146.
- Anderson, S. (2022). The truth about teacher salaries and its effects on teachers and students. California State University, Chico. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12680/g732dg94s>
- Antonio, G. C. (2023). Resilience and sense of self-efficacy among Filipino educators during the 2019 corona virus pandemic. *American Journal of IR 4.0 and Beyond*, 2(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajirb.v2i1.1457>
- Bashaija, A., Atibuni, D. Z., & Rukundo, A. (2022). Demographic characteristics and occupational stress by secondary school teachers in Greater Bushenyi, Uganda. *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences* 3(2),73-77. <https://doi.org/10.46606/eajess2022v03i02.0161>.
- Cagape, W.E, Baog, I.W, Magayo, J.C., & Clerigo, K.O. (2021). Work commitment among public secondary school teachers in Davao City. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 12 (11), 1043-1049. Retrieved from https://www.ijser.org/research-paper-publishing-november-2021_page2.aspx
- Galanakis, M., Alexiou, E., Androutsopoulou, A., Chiotaki, I., Mouselimidou, I., Mylona-Fountzoula, M., Papadopoulou, C. & Tsirozidi, S. (2020) Occupational Stress Relation to Tenure and Educational Level in Primary School Teachers in Greece. *Psychology*, 11, 865-873. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2020.116056>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Graham, L. J., White, S. L., Cologon, K., & Pianta, R. C. (2020). Do teachers' years of experience make a difference in the quality of teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 96, 103190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103190>
- Gustafson, K. (2015). Increasing the Teaching Profession's Collaborative Capacity: A Proposal of Organizational Change to Reduce Stress Experienced by Teachers (Doctoral dissertation, City University of Seattle).
- Halim, R. A., & Ahmad, H. H. (2015). Distributed leadership, contextual factor and teachers' self-efficacy in Malaysia. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 3(3), 1-12.
- Huang, S., & Yin, H. (2018). Teacher efficacy and affective well-being in Hong Kong: An examination of their relationships and individual differences. *ECNU Review of Education*, 1(2), 102-126. <https://doi.org/10.30926/ecnuoe2018010205>
- Hughes, A. L., Matt, J. J., & O'Reilly, F. L. (2014). Principal support is imperative to the retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(1), 129-134. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i1.622>
- Islam, T., Ahmad, Z., Ahmed, I., Ahmad, A., Saeed, M., & Muhammad, S. K. (2012). Does compensation and demographical variable influence on teachers commitment and job satisfaction? a study of university of the Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(4), 35.
- Ismael, J., Lazzaro, A. E., & Ishihara, B. (2021). It takes heart: the experiences and working conditions of caring educators. *Radical Teacher* (Cambridge), 119(119), 30-40. <https://doi.org/10.5195/rt.2021.707>
- Jordan, G. Y., & Oliva E.R.D. (2022). A structural equation model on teacher turn-over intention in relation to organizational commitment, school culture and work environment. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 13(29). 87-103. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/13-29-10>
- Kabito, G., & Wami, S. (2020). Perceived work related stress and its associated factors among public secondary school teachers in Gondar city: a cross-sectional study from Ethiopia. *BMC Notes*, 13(36), 2-7.
- Korso, G. B. (2013). Teachers' perceived commitment as measured by age, gender and school type. *Greener Journal of Educational Research*, 3(8), 363-372. <https://doi.org/10.15580/gjer.2013.8.080913830>
- Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Yee, D. S. (2016). School Organizational Context. *American Educational Research Journal* and student achievement, 53, 1411-1449. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831216667478>
- Laily, N., & Wahyuni, D. U. (2023). Teacher performance based on stress and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 7(12), 192-199.
- Lazarides, R., & Warner, L. M. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy. *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.890>
- Malagisic, M. T., Petalla, M. B., & Doromal, A. D. (2021). Self-efficacy and work commitment of the private senior high school teachers in time of pandemic. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 60 (4), 345-359. Retrieved from <https://www.gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/13568>
- Mahmood, K., Ghaffar, A., & Ullah, M. I. (2022). Demographic factors and job stress among school teachers of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 3(2), 126-136. <https://doi.org/10.52223/jess.20223208>
- Miller, T. M. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy and years of experience: Their relation to teacher commitment and intention to leave [Doctoral dissertation]. <https://hdl.handle.net/1808/34216>
- Mwesiga, A., & Okendo, E. (2018). Levels of teachers commitment to the teaching profession in secondary schools in Kagera Region, Tanzania. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(14), 117-127.
- Rabago-Mingoa, T. (2017). Filipino teachers stress levels and coping strategies. In *De La Salle State University Research Congress*.
- Rani, S., & Jain, R. (2023). Understanding the relationship between gender and experience in the self-efficacy of Indian teacher educators. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 7(1), 953-964.
- Räsänen, K., Pietarinen, J., Pyhälä, K., Soini, T., & Väisänen, P. (2020). Why leave the teaching profession? A longitudinal approach to the prevalence and persistence of teacher turnover intentions. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23, 837-859. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-020-09567-x>
- Sarabia, A., & Collantes, L. M. (2020). Work-related stress and teaching performance of teachers in selected school in the Philippines. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 4(1), 6-27. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v4i1.8084>
- Seeram, E. (2019). An overview of correlational research. *American Society of Radiologic Technologists*, 91.
- Shuls, J., & Flores, J. (2020). Improving teacher retention through support and development. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 4(1). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1282763>
- Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 34(1), 8-12. <https://doi.org/10.1097/nur.0000000000000493>
- Tarraya, H. (2023, June 24). Teachers' workload policy: Its impact on Philippine public school teachers. *Puissant*, 4. Retrieved from <https://puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/246>
- Thien, L. M., Razak, N. A., & Ramayah, T. (2014). Validating teacher commitment scale using a Malaysian sample. *SAGE Open*, 4(2), 215824401453674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014536744>
- Torkaman, F., Farhang, S., Zakerian, S. A., Torkaman, M., & Niaragh, H. K. (2017). A study on the effect of job burnout and stress on job satisfaction among teachers of exceptional school. *Pharmacophore*. <https://pharmacophorejournal.com/5PHGY7o>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
- Ulaş, M., & Şenel, E., (2020). The relationship between commitment to teaching, teacher efficacy, marginalisation and isolation: A study on physical education teachers. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 15(6), 1439-1453. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i6.5217>
- Ünal Z., & Ünal A.. (2012). The impact of years of teaching experience on the classroom management approaches of elementary school teachers. *International journal of Instruction*, 5(2). <https://www.e-iji.net/volumes/318-july-2012-volume-5-number-2>
- Yusoff, M. S. (2019). ABC of content validation and content validity index calculation. *Education in Medicine Journal*, 11(2), 49-54. <https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2019.11.2.6>
- Zeb, S., & Nawaz, A. (2016). Impacts of self-efficacy on organizational commitment of academicians a case of Gomal university. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, 6(1). <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/IKM/article/view/28365>
- Zedan, R. (2012) Stress and coping strategies among elementary schools teachers in Israel. *Universal Journal of Education and General Studies*. 1(9), 265-278. Retrieved from <http://www.universalresearchjournals.org/ujegs>.