International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Vol. 24, Issue 06, 2020
ISSN: 1475-7192

Perceived Stressors of Public Teacher Education Students

[1]Jayanthi Shanker, [2]*Sanil S Hishan

ABSTRACT *–The study was conducted to determine the personal, home-related and school-related profile and stressors of students in Brigade School in India. The relationship between the profile variables and extent of stressors of the respondents and the difference in the stressors of the respondents when grouped by profile variables was likewise determined. The descriptive-correlational research design was used to describe and interpret the profile variables, the relationship between the profile variables and the extent of stressors, and the difference in the stressors when grouped according to profile variables. Majority of the 2,295 respondents are 19 years old, single, female, and Roman Catholics. They reside within driving distance from the school. Their mothers are mostly 46 year-old high school graduate housekeepers, and their fathers are mostly 48 year-old high school graduate farmers. The family consists of four siblings with two married and three unmarried siblings. They are third year Bachelor of Secondary Education students of. Financial-related factors were perceived the most stressful and environmental-related factors were ranked the least. On the average, all factors are "moderately stressful" and show moderate correlation with the students' fathers' educational attainments. Moreover, the stressors have a slight correlation with their mother's occupation, campus, year level, and field of specialization. Hence, the null hypotheses were rejected. In conclusion, the respondents were moderately stressed financially, and their stress is interrelated to their father's educational attainment, mother's occupation, the campus where they are enrolled, year level, and field of specialization.*

Keywords – *Perceived Stressors, Extent of Stressors, personal-related profile, home-related profile, chool-related* ***profile***

I. INTRODUCTION

College life is one of the most significant experiences that one goes through as it is a turning point in a person's life. It is where one shares common platforms and further exchange opinions, behavior, and culture. College is a wonderful opportunity, but it is not exempted from stressful situations. Stress means a feeling that is full of anxiety and pressure which often occurs when one makes a big decision or copes with lots of problems. It is defined as an organism's total response to an environmental condition or stimulus also known as "stressor".

College students face a host of stressors and usually experience financial stress which involves the struggle to find sufficient money to pay for tuition and securing the funds needed to cover the costs of living while attending school [1]. Too much debt and insufficient money are reasons that a person may feel stress which consequently becomes one of the largest stressors on relationships.

University provides students' tertiary education and psychosocial development [2]. Besides pursuing knowledge in university, a student also gets to socialize with different kinds of people and undergo psychological

[1] *Csrfirst Research Academy, Mangalore, India*

[2] **Csrfirst Research Academy, Mangalore, India, hishanssanil@gmail.com*

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

development. While this is so, studies show that entering university may bring strain or stress [3]. This is because university students face a changing education system, lifestyle, and social environment. University students need to reach certain levels of academic achievement to graduate. The academic achievement is determined by their performance during classroom activities, assignments, presentations and examinations [4]. This means that they are evaluated throughout the semester. Besides, most students have moved out from home or commuting daily must have to be wise in managing their time and activities. Students tend to lose self-confidence having to establish new social relations and at the same time trying to cope with increasing academic demands [5].

Recent study indicates a nationwide increase in college students' stress [6]. Academic stressors include the student's perception of the extensive knowledge base required and the perception of inadequate time to develop it [7]. Students report experiencing academic stress predictably, with the greatest sources of academic stress being found in taking and studying for exams and with respect to grade competition and the large amount of content to master in a small amount of time [8], [9]. Academics means taking midterms and finals, writing research papers and completing projects. This is, after all, the hallmark of measuring what one has learned [10]. Coursework can be very demanding and the competition for earning top marks can be very fierce. Students who want to do their best and who are planning to apply for admission to graduate school can be under a great deal of pressure as they struggle to excel in school. The same is true for those who are seeking scholarship funding or who must keep their grades up in order to keep existing scholarship awards.

Young adults learn attitudes and behavior, in part, through the observation and imitation of role models they come in contact with, especially their parents. Financial habits that are formed during the transition to adulthood are likely to persist throughout adulthood. College students with stronger intentions to perform positive behaviors were more pleased with their financial situation and less likely to incur debt [11].

A study found out that when teachers are stressed, so are their students. Teachers who experience higher levels of burnout report to be more stressed, less effective in teaching and classroom management, less connected to their students, and less satisfied with their work. Considering that classroom teachers can take on many roles for students, including mentor, role model and parental roles, it is possible that spending most of the school day in interaction with a stressed and burned out teacher is taxing for students and can affect their physiological stress profile. Burned out teachers may also have fewer resources and support which could also contribute to student stress [12].

Teaching as a profession is a demanding job that requires highly intellectual activities [13]. However, there are various intellectual symptoms of stress that can affect people in the profession. These include memory problem, confusion, poor judgment, lack of concentration, while the emotional symptoms can be anger, irritation, moody, and depression. All of these can have negative adverse effects on the teachers' functionality [14]. The degree of stress which teachers experience is positively related to the degree which one perceives as a lack of control over a potentially threatening situation [15]. Higher levels of dissatisfaction with work and occupational stress have also been associated with teacher performance, absenteeism and leaving the job [16]. There were identified main sources of stress faced by teachers as teaching students who lacked motivation, maintenance of discipline, time pressures and workload, coping with changes, being evaluated by others, dealing with colleagues, self-esteem and status, administration and management, role conflict and ambiguity and poor working conditions as these could also affect teachers' productivity [17].

Education has gradually moved from settings in the natural environment to buildings which have been especially designed for the purpose. Designed environments function to provide a climate which is primarily conducive to both teaching and learning. Winston Churchill once said, "We shape our buildings and then they shape us." If this is true, then there is no designed environment that needs immediate attention more than the school facility does. The built environment only intrudes on the consciousness when it causes pleasure, harm, discomfort, or stress. Increasing numbers of educators and planners have begun to believe that other dimensions of the physical environment might have an effect on those involved in the educating process. There is growing evidence that the designed environment of schools may stress users of the facility both directly and indirectly [18]. Due to the continually changing nature of the university environment, students can potentially experience high levels of stress that can affect their health and academic performance [19].

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to determine the stressors of college students enrolled in Brigade school Specifically, it looked into the following:

1. What is the profile of the respondents as to their:
   1.a Personal profile of the students
   1.b Home related profile of the students
   1.c School-related profile of the students
2. What are the perceived stressors among the respondents?
3. To what extent do the respondents find the following indicators stressful?
   a. Health-related stressors
   b. Academic-related stressors
   c. Time-related stressors
   d. Family-related stressors
   e. Financial-related stressors
   f. Self-related stressors
   g. Social/Interpersonal-related stressors
   h. Teaching Quality/Support
   i. Teacher-related stressors
   j. Environmental/Campus/Administrative-related stressors
4. Is there a relationship between the select profile variables and extent of stressors of the respondents?
5. Is there a difference in the stressors of the respondents when grouped by select profile variables?

Hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between the select profile variables and extent of the stressors of the respondents.

2. There is no difference in the stressors of the respondents when grouped by select profile variables.

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

The descriptive-correlational method of research was used to describe and interpret the variables used in the study, namely the profile of the respondents, the perceived stressors of the respondents, the extent the respondents find the indicators stressful, the relationship between the select profile variables and the extent of their stressors, and the difference of the stressors of the students when grouped by select profile variables.

Respondents and Procedure

The study was conducted in the College of Teacher Education. The respondents are 2, 295 students enrolled across programs who were randomly selected using the systematic random sampling technique. The structured survey questionnaire was used in the study.

Relevant authorities in the University were notified of and acceded to the conduct of the study. The respondents were also informed of the objectives of the study, and their consent to be the respondents was secured. After which, the researcher personally distributed the questionnaire to the respondents.

Data Analysis

The data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using descriptive statistics – frequency count, percentage, mean, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, and single factor-ANOVA.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Personal profile of the students

Table 1: a Personal profile of the students.

Category	Frequency (n = 2295)	Percent
Age		
16 – 17	492	21.4
18 – 19	1056	46.0
20 – 21	539	23.5
22 – 23	114	5.0
24 – 25	44	1.9
26 & older	50	2.2
Mean = 19.15 SD = 2.24		
Sex		
Female	1748	76.2

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

Male	547	23.8
Civil Status		
Single	2169	94.5
Married	124	5.4
Widow	2	0.1
Religion		
Iglesia ni Cristo	183	8
Roman Catholic	1613	70.3
Pentecost	59	2.6
Methodist	50	2.2
Church of Christ	48	2.1
Aglipayan	22	1
Born Again	134	5.8
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	22	1
Protestant	8	0.3
Baptist	47	2
Jehovah's Witnesses	24	1
Others (e.g., Adventist, UCCP, etc.)	85	3.7

Table 1.a, which shows the distribution of the students' age ranging from 16-36, indicates that the mean age is 19 and majority of the respondents are 18-19 years old. This is influenced by the University's response to the Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) call to accept high school graduates who were unable to proceed to tertiary education or college students who stopped schooling before the new higher education curriculum is implemented in SY 2018-2019. Collectively called "lifelong learners," these are high school graduates in SY 2014-2015 or earlier under the old 10-year Basic Education Curriculum [20],[26],[27].

Most of the students enrolled in the College of Teacher Education are female (76.17%) and only 28.83% are male. This is indicative that female teachers would most likely dominate the teaching profession. It can be further inferred from the table that 94.51% are single, 5.40% are married, and 0.09 % are widowed. Most of the respondents (70.28%) are Roman Catholics, followed by Iglesia ni Cristo, Born Again Christians, Pentecosts, and Methodists comprising 7.97%, 5.84%, 2.57%, and 2.18%, respectively. The remaining 11.16% of the respondents belong to other religious affiliations.

Home related profile of the students

Table 1.b : Home-related profile of students.

Category	Frequency (n = 2295)	Percent
Living Arrangement		
Dormitory	326	14.2
Residence within walking distance	496	21.6
Residence within driving distance	1473	64.2
Mother's Age		
35 & younger	30	1.3
36 – 45	1045	45.5
46 – 55	871	38.0
56 – 65	193	8.4
66 & older	17	.7
No response	139	6.1
Mean = 46.41 SD = 6.92		
Mother's Educational Attainment		
Elementary graduate	448	19.5
Elementary undergraduate	159	6.9
High school graduate	825	35.9
High school undergraduate	181	7.9
College graduate	319	13.9
College undergraduate	213	9.3
Vocational	8	0.3
Master's degree	2	0.1
Doctoral degree	1	0
Not Applicable	139	6.1

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

Mother's Occupation		
Housekeeping	1466	63.9
Farming	93	4.1
Driving	18	0.8
OFW	176	7.7
Teacher	73	3.2
Vendor	61	2.7
Business	24	1
Barangay Health Worker	19	0.8
Government Official	19	0.8
No work	103	4.5
Others (e.g., 28, 33, 8)	104	4.3
Not applicable	139	6.1
Father's Age		
35 & younger	36	1.6
36 – 45	730	31.8
46 – 55	901	39.3
56 – 65	308	13.4
66 & older	44	1.9
No response	276	12.0
Mean = 48.84 SD= 7.52		
Father's Education		
Elementary graduate	425	18.5
Elementary undergraduate	193	8.4
High school graduate	697	30.4
High school undergraduate	209	9.1
College graduate	250	10.9

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

College undergraduate	212	9.2
Vocational	31	1.4
Master's degree	3	.1
Doctoral degree	1	.0
Not Applicable	274	11.9
Father's Occupation		
Housekeeping	32	1.4
Farming	1164	50.7
Driving	219	9.5
OFW	34	1.5
Laborer	90	3.9
Carpenter	102	4.4
Security Guard	23	1.0
Fishermen	37	1.6
No work	80	3.5
Others (e.g., 5, 9,15)	239	10.4
Not Applicable	275	12.0
Number of Siblings		
1 – 2	313	13.6
3 – 4	959	41.8
5 – 6	618	26.9
7 – 8	268	11.7
9 – 10	89	3.9
11 & more	48	2.1
Mean = 4.66 SD = 2.13		
Number of Married Siblings		
No	69	3
1 – 2	1763	76.8
3 – 4	347	15.1
5 – 6	88	3.9
7 & more	28	1.1

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

Mean = 1.76 SD = 1.35		
Number of Unmarried Siblings		
None	27	1.2
1 – 2	997	43.4
3 – 4	946	41.2
5 – 6	259	11.3
7 – 8	56	2.4
9 & more	10	0.4
Mean = 2.90 SD = 1.60		
Monthly Income		
1,000-below	214	9.3
1001-5000	1211	52.8
5001-10000	502	21.9
10001-15000	157	6.8
15001-20000	99	4.3
20001-25000	30	1.3
25001-30000	36	1.6
30001-35000	7	.3
35001-40000	7	.3
40001-45000	4	.2
45001-50000	8	.3
50001-55000	20	.9

As gleaned in table 2, most of the respondents (64.18%) reside within driving distance from the school. The respondents' mother's age ranges from 28 to 90 years old with a mean age of 46 and majority (45.5%) are 36-45 years old. Generally, their mothers are high school graduates and housekeepers. The respondents' father's age ranges from 32 to 91 years old with a mean age of 48 and most (39.3%) are 46-55 years old. Majority of the fathers are high school graduates and engaged in farming.

Meanwhile, 14.9% and 25.9% of the respondents' mothers and fathers, respectively revealed that they do not participate in any occupation. Such would not mean unemployment because these mothers and fathers are engaged in jobs lacking decent working conditions. They may be engaged in vulnerable employment like informal non-agriculture employment. Typically, they either work with unregistered companies in the informal economy or as unpaid family workers. These poor working conditions provide them limited opportunities for social mobility.

Those in vulnerable employment are also part of the visibly underemployed who works less than the 40 hours a week and who are seeking or available for additional work. [21].

The mean number of siblings is four, and 41.8% of the families are medium sized, i.e. comprising 3-4 siblings. The table also shows that most of the respondents have two married and three unmarried siblings. Majority of the respondents' monthly family income is not lower than Php1,000 but not as much as Php5,000 which means that the monthly wages of most of the parents is below the minimum earner's current real monthly wage which is P8, 728 [22]. Such data would further imply that the educational attainment of the parents in turn affects the kind of occupation they may have and that they could hardly land into permanent and highly paid jobs.

School- related profile of the students

Table 1.c: School-related profile of the students

Category	Frequency (n = 2295)	Percent
Campus		
Aparri Campus	426	18.6
Gonzaga Campus	157	6.8
Lallo Campus	179	7.8
Lasam Campus	184	8.0
Piat Campus	197	8.6
Sanchez Mira Campus	242	10.5
Andrews Campus	910	39.7
Year Level		
First Year	113	4.9
Second Year	696	30.3
Third Year	830	36.2
Fourth Year	656	28.6
Program/Major		
BSED Department	**1368**	**59.61**
Biological Science Major	132	5.8
English Major	361	15.7
Filipino Major	163	7.1
Mathematics Major	186	8.1
Physical Science Major	120	5.2
Social Science Major	185	8.1

TLE Major	184	8.0
MAPEH	37	1.6
BEED Department	**802**	**34.94**
Generalist	759	33.1
PSED	43	1.9
BTTE Department	**125**	**5.45**

The College of Teacher Education is strategically situated in the seven campuses of the University where the respondents are enrolled. The college offers three programs: Bachelor of Secondary Education with eight specializations, Bachelor of Elementary Education with two fields of specialization, and Bachelor of Technical Teacher Education with three fields of specialization. The table below shows that most of the respondents were enrolled in Andrews Campus (39.7%); were in the third year level (36.2%); and 59.61% were taking up Bachelor of Secondary Education.

Perceived stressors among the respondents

Table 2: Stressors and their applicability to the students.

Stressors	Mean	Rank
Financial-related	3.51	1
Academic-related	3.84	2
Time-related	4.41	3
Health-related	5.14	4
Family-related	5.30	5.5
Self-related	5.30	5.5
Teaching quality/support	5.54	6
Social/Interpersonal-related	5.79	7
Environmental-related	6.05	8

Table 2 reveals that most of the respondents' stressors were perceived to be financially-related (3.51) while least of their stressors were perceived to be environmental-related (6.05).

Extent of stressors among the respondents

Table 3: Extent of stressors among the student-respondents.

Stressors	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
Health-related stressors	2.77	Moderately Stressful

Received: 27 Feb 2019 | Revised: 20 Mar 2019 | Accepted: 30 Apr 2020

Academic-related stressors	2.88	Moderately Stressful
Time-related stressors	2.92	Moderately Stressful
Family-related stressors	2.84	Moderately Stressful
Financial-related stressors	3.03	Moderately Stressful
Self-related stressors	2.75	Moderately Stressful
Social/Interpersonal–related stressors	2.38	A little bit stressful
Teaching Quality/Support from Teachers-related stressors	2.95	Moderately Stressful
Environmental/Campus/Administrative-related stressors	2.70	Moderately Stressful
Over-all Weighted Mean	**2.81**	**Moderately Stressful**

Table 3 showed that with an over-all weighted mean of 2.81, all the stressors are **moderately stressful** to the respondents. Among the perceived stressors, financial-related factors though **moderately stressful** cause the highest extent of stress with a mean of 3.03, whereas social/interpersonal-related stressors perceived to be "**a little bit stressful**" cause the least extent of stress with a mean of 2.38.

Relationship between stressors of the respondents and select profile variables

Table 4: Relationship between stressors of the students and select profile variables

Variables	**Stressors**		**Decision**
	r-value	**prob.**	
Age	.009^{ns}	.657	Accept Ho
Civil Status	.024^{ns}	.260	Accept Ho
Year Level	.012^{ns}	.579	Accept Ho
Mother's Age	-.007^{ns}	.755	Accept Ho
Mother's Educational Attainment	.004^{ns}	.848	Accept Ho
Father's Age	-.042^{ns}	.059	Accept Ho
Father's Educational Attainment	.045*	.041	Reject Ho
Number of Siblings	.003^{ns}	.877	Accept Ho
Number of Married Siblings	.001^{ns}	.954	Accept Ho
Number of Unmarried Siblings	.002^{ns}	.917	Accept Ho

Monthly Income	-.011 ns	.586	Accept Ho

* = significant at 0.05

** = significant at 0.01 level

ns = not significant

The study hypothesized that there is no relationship between the select profile variables and the extent of stressors of the respondents. As gleaned in Table 5, the father's educational attainment is moderately correlated with the stressors of the students as reflected by its yielded Pearson Product Moment test computed r-value of 0.045 and associated probability value of 0.041 which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

In connection to the findings in Table 1.b that most of the respondents' fathers are high school graduates, this implies that this becomes a stressor among the respondents because their fathers would most likely challenge them to pursue a higher degree which they were not able to achieve.

While almost any man can father a child, there is so much more to the important role of being a father in a child's life. **Fathers are central to the emotional well-being of their children; they are capable caretakers and disciplinarians.** Similarly, studies show that if the child's father is affectionate, supportive, and involved, he can contribute greatly to the child's cognitive, language, and social development, as well as academic achievement, a strong inner core resource, sense of well-being, good self-esteem, and authenticity [23],[28],[29],[30].

Comparisons on the stressors of the respondents grouped by select variable

Table 5: Comparison on the stressors of the students grouped by select variables

.

PSED	199.116			
Variables	**Mean**	**Stressors**		**Decision**
		Computed t-value	**Prob.**	
Sex				
Male	198.584			
Female	200.419	0.876ns	.381	Accept Ho
Civil Status				
Single	198.795			
Married	202.905	1.049 ns	.295	Accept Ho
Religion				
Non-Roman Catholic	200.424	1.022 ns	.307	Accept Ho
Roman Catholic	198.428			

Mother's Occupation				
Housekeeping	197.487			
Non-housekeeping	203.944	3.015**	.003	Reject Ho
Father's Occupation				
Non-farming	199.594	.926 ns	.355	Accept Ho
Farming	197.707			
		F-ratio	**Prob.**	
Campus				
Aparri Campus	196.394			
Gonzaga Campus	199.395			
Lallo Campus	199.397			
Lasam Campus	188.114			
Piat Campus	203.579	3.799**	.001	Reject Ho
Sanchez Mira Campus	195.550			
Andrews Campus	202.254			
Year Level				
First Year	188.770			
Second Year	200.938	2.644*	.048	Reject Ho
Third Year	198.789			
Fourth Year	199.046			
Program/Major				
Biological Science Major	209.311	5.181**	.000	Reject Ho
English Major	204.789			
Filipino Major	200.853			
Mathematics Major	199.699			

Physical Science Major	207.600			
Social Science Major	200.751			
TLE Major	182.663			
BTTE	196.304			
BEED (Generalist)	196.279			
MAPEH	204.730			

* = significant at 0.05

** = significant at 0.01 level

ns = not significant

The study also hypothesized that there is no difference in the stressors of the respondents when grouped by select profile variables. Results of the single factor-ANOVA revealed a slight correlation as reflected by its computed t-value of 3.015 (mother's occupation/non-housekeeping); f-ratios of 3.799 (Piat Campus); 2.644 (second year) and 5.181 (field of specialization) where the associated probability values are 0.003, 0.001, 0.048 and 0.000 respectively, which are significantly lower than the level of significance set at 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected [31],[32],[33],[34].

Consequently, findings (from table 1.b) reveal that most students are residing within driving distance and more likely not monitored and guided by working mothers. Hence, they are more subjected to stressful situations like waking up early to cope with early academic schedules, stretching their budget for personal and academic purposes, managing their time in doing household chores and preparing instructional materials and other requirements such as Field Study portfolios and projects.

CSU Piat is an agriculture-based campus, and the students are susceptible to limiting factors like transportation and communication, accessibility of the campus to facilities for instruction, provisions on internet connectivity, academic qualifications or preparation of teachers, and location of the campus being a source of stress[35],[36],[37],[38],[39].

Findings also show that stressors are experienced much by second year level students probably because there were no first year enrolled and second year students are at the peak of adjusting to the requirements of their course because they could hardly budget their time and attention between General Education and Professional Education subjects for the BEED students and among General Education, Professional Education, and Major subjects in the case of BSED and BTTE students.

The stressors of students whose field of specialization is Biological Science significantly differ with that of other fields. This somehow highlights the peculiarity of Biological Science as a field of specialization since students need not only master technical concepts but also have to analyze and apply through scientific process the concepts they have learned. Moreover, the curriculum for the Biological Science is heavily loaded with subjects with laboratory classes. Thus, it is expected that projects and requirements are too heavy for the students to comply with.

V. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the respondents were moderately financially stressed and their stressors are interrelated to their father's educational attainment, mother's occupation, the campus where they are enrolled, year level, and field of specialization.

In view of the results and findings of the study, it is recommended that administrators link with more scholarship benefactors to increase the number of financial assistance provided to the students; teachers avoid requiring costly projects to students to minimize financial burden among the students; the university expand and diversify evidence-based therapeutic interventions for prevention and management of stress-related consequences; guidance counselors include in their program of growth session activities topics like financial literacy, peer counselling, and the like; the university provide a physical space for wellness services with resources for students when experiencing conflict or stress and a student anti-stress corner to pour out problems and reflections; administrators encourage students to access counseling and wellness service at the Guidance Office; and similar studies be conducted with students of other course offerings, faculty, and staff of the University as respondents.

REFERENCES

1. Caldwell, M. (2018, April 02). Five strategies to deal with financial stress. Retrieved from http://www.thebalance.com/dealing-with-financial-stress-2385957.
2. Tao, S., Dong, Q., Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., & Pancer, S. M. (2000). Social support: Relations to coping and adjustment during the transition to university in the People's Republic of China. Journal of Adolescent Research, 5(1), 123-144. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811027492.
3. Gall, T.L., Evans, D.R. & Bellerose S. (2000). Transition to first-year University: Patterns of change in adjustment across life domains and time. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19 (4) (2000), pp: 544-567. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811027492.
4. Ong, Bessie, & Cheong, K. C. (2009). Sources of stress among college students - the case of a credit transfer programme [Electronic version]. College Student Journal, 43(4). Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811027492.
5. Habibah, E., Ping, W. S., & Abdullah, M.C. (2011). Stress and academic achievement among undergraduate students in Universiti Putra Malaysia. Pocedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29, 2011, pp. 646-655. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811027492.
6. Misra, R. and Castillo, L.G. (2004). Academic stress among college students: Comparison of American and International students. DOI:10.1037/1072-5245.11.2.132.
7. Carveth, J.A., Gesse, T., & Moss, N. (1996). Survival strategies for nurse-midwifery students. Journal of Nurse-Midwifery, 41(1), 50-54. Retrieved from http://www.research.net/publication/2283678
8. Abouserie, R. (1994). Sources and levels of stress in relation to locus and control and self-esteem in university students. Educational Psychology, 14, 323-330. Retrieved from http://www.research.net/publication/2283678

9. Kohn, J.P. & Frazer, G.H. (1986). An academic stress scale: identification and rated importance of academic stressors. Psychological Reports, 59, 415-426. Retrieved from http://www.research.net/publication/228367874.
10. Seaward, B. L. (2018). Managing Stress Principles and Strategies for Health and Well-being. 9th edition. Jones and Bart Lett Learning. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.ph/.
11. Britt, S.L., Anthony, C., Fred, F., Stutz, K. and Tibets, R (2015) Financial Stress and Financial Counseling: Helping College Students. Journal of Financial Counselling and Planning. Vol 26, Issue 2 2015. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1088924.pdf.
12. Sifferlin, A. (2016). Stress is Contagious in the Classroom. Time-Health. Retrieved from http://time.com/4384135/stress-burnout-teachers/.
13. Yusoff, M. S. B, Rahim, A. F. A., & Yaacob, M. J. (2010). Prevalence and sources of stress among University Sains Malaysia medical students. Malaysia Journal of Medical Science, 17(1). Retrieved from http://file.scirp.org/pdf/CE_2015102918133707.pdf.
14. Morgan, M., & Kitching, K. (2007). Teaching in disadvantaged school: Job satisfaction of beginning Teachers. In A. L. Gilligan, & P. Downes (Eds.), Educational Disadvantage in Ireland (pp. 367-378). Dublin: Institute of Public Administration. Retrieved from http://file.scirp.org/pdf/CE_2015102918133707.pdf.
15. Hock, & Roger (1996). Professional burnout among public school teachers. Public Personnel Management, 101, 167-189. Retrieved from http://file.scirp.org/pdf/CE_2015102918133707.pdf.
16. Kyriacou, S., Kunc, R., Stephens, P., & Hultgren, A. (2003). Student teachers' expectations of teaching as a aareer in england and norway. Educational Review, 55, 255-263. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013191032000118910. Retrieved from http://file.scirp.org/pdf/CE_2015102918133707.pdf.
17. Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: directions for future research, educational review. Educational Review, 53, 27-35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910120033628. Retrieved from http://file.scirp.org/pdf/CE_2015102918133707.pdf.
18. Conners, D. A. (1983). The School Environment: A Link to Understanding Stress. Journal Article Vol. 22 No. 1. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476235.
19. Hamaideh, S.H. (2011). Stressors and reactions to stressors among university students. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 57(1), 69-80. Retrieved from http://www.nwpc.dole.gov.ph/pages/rb-2/cmwr.html.
20. Albert, J. R. G. and Vizmanos, J.F. (2017). Closing the gender gap in economic Opportunities. Retrieved from http://www.rappler.com/thought-leaders/134739-gender-equality-economic-opportunities-philippines.
21. CHED: SY 2017-2018 best chance for lifelong learners to go to college (2017, May 15). Retrieved from https://chedk12.wordpress.com/2017/05/15/ched-sy-2017-2018-best-chance-for-lifelong-learners-to-go-to-college/.
22. Current daily minimum wage rates region II, Cagayan Valleys (2017, September 25). Retrieved from http://www.nwpc.dole.gov.ph/pages/rb-2/cmwr.html.
23. Gross, G. (2014, August 12). The important role of dad. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-gail-gross/the-important-role-of-dad_b_5489093.html.

24. \University student stress. (2018, April 8). [Wikiversity]. Retrieved from http://wikiversity.org/wiki/University_student_stress.
25. Hishan, S. S., Ramakrishnan, S., Manokaran, K. R., & Vaicondam, Y. (2020). Corporate social responsibility for natural disaster: A new method for organizational risk management. Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems, 12(1 Special Issue), 111-115. doi:10.5373/JARDCS/V12SP1/20201053
26. Hishan, S. S., Ramakrishnan, S., Mansor, N. N. B. A., & Qureshi, M. I. (2020). Adoptability of machine learning and its relationship to learning style preferences. International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 29(4 Special Issue), 896-912.
27. Jena, M. K., Nayak, N., Chen, K., & Nayak, N. R. (2019). Role of macrophages in pregnancy and related complications. Archivum immunologiae et therapiae experimentalis, 67(5) 295-309.
28. Singh, H., Narang, J. K., Singla, Y. P., Narang, R. S., & Mishra, V. (2017). TPGS stabilized sublingual films of frovatriptan for the management of menstrual migraine: Formulation, design and antioxidant activity. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology, 41, 144-156.
29. Kaur, H., Kaur, G., & Kumar, S. (2019). A Comparative Study of Body Mass Indices and Waist-Hip Ratios of Women in Relation to their Menstrual Status. Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development, 10(2), 1042-1046
30. Upadhyay, S., Kumar, A. R., Raghuvanshi, R. S., & Singh, B. B. (2011). Impact of nutrition education on knowledge and haemoglobin status of hill women in Uttarakhand State of India. Malaysian journal of nutrition, 17(3), 347-357.
31. Lotfan, M., Ali, S. A., Yadav, M. L., Choudhary, S., Jena, M. K., Kumar, S., & Mohanty, A. K. (2018). Genome-wide gene expression analysis of 45 days pregnant fetal cotyledons vis-a-vis non-pregnant caruncles in buffalo (Bubalus bubalis). Gene, 654, 127-137.
32. Upadhyay, S., Kumar, S., & Sharma, A. (2013). Effectiveness of folifer supplementation alone vs supplementation in combination to nutrition education onbirth outcomes of rural women, India. Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism, 63, 740-741.
33. Kansra, P. (2018). Economic Burden of Diabetes among Women: A Comparison of Outpatient and Inpatient Care. Journal of Health Management, 20(3), 401-409.
34. Ruspini, E., & Bonifacio, G. T. (Eds.). (2018). Women and Religion: Contemporary and Future Challenges in the Global Era. Policy Press.
35. Prakash, C., Thakur, G. S. M., Vashisht, N., & Kumar, R. (2017). UMEED-a fuzzy rule-based legal expert system to address domestic violence against women. In Advances in Computer and Computational Sciences (pp. 631-638). Springer, Singapore.
36. Devi, S., Singh, K., & Pankaj, P. P. (2016). Prevalence, pathogenesis and diagnosis of sexual dysfunctions in diabetic women. International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences, 7(1B), 221-225.
37. Singh, B. (2016). Libidinal capitalism and women subscribers. Man in India, 96(4), 1055-1059.
38. Singh, K. (2016). Urban working women in the reflection of Indian society. Man in India, 96(4), 969-974