Psychological capital is an essential factor that influences teachers’ productivity, commitment, and overall performance. The study determined the psychological capital, emotional labor, and stress index of public-school teachers in Tubigon Districts. It is a descriptive-correlational study using standardized survey tools as data gathering tools. Three hundred fifty (350) participants were chosen through random sampling technique from Tubigon East and West Districts, Division of Bohol, as of the schoolyear 2020 – 2021. It utilized standardized tools, namely: Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ-24) by Luthans, Avolio, Avey and Norman (2007), Emotional Labor of Teacher Scale (TELTS) by Brown (2011), and Wilson Stress Profile for Teachers (WSPT) by Rosenberg (2010). Results revealed that respondents’ age, sex, religious affiliation, and years of service are related to psychological capital. The civil status and highest educational status are not statistically connected with psychological capital. Furthermore, only sex and education have significant relationship with emotional labor. Moreover, the teacher respondents’ profile, such
as religious affiliation and highest educational status, has a significant association with stress level. Conversely, age, sex, civil status, and years of service said otherwise. The results also revealed that psychological capital has a significant relationship with emotional labor and stress index. Emotional labor did not influence stress levels. When aggregated based on sex, their psychological capital and emotional labor differ; however, no significant difference in terms of stress index.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Teaching is a well-known profession that exerts enormous pressure on a particular individual, which emanates from the job itself. Teachers expect to go through emotional travails as they struggle to survive in the profession and wholeheartedly deal with learners, co-teachers, administrators, parents, and other stakeholders. A dedicated teacher’s to-do list is never-ending, with a mountain of modules and activity sheets to prepare and check. These emotional demands are frequently associated with undesirable outcomes, such as tiredness, burnout, job discontent, and declining work enthusiasm.

Alson (2019) reported that stress is a pervasive factor in teachers’ lives in the Philippines, negatively affecting their performance. It reduces individual and institutional efficiency, which has a profound effect on educational institutions. Meanwhile, the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in a dramatic shift in the learning modalities employed in various schools across the nation, has exacerbated the obstacles and problems faced by public school teachers. The overlapping responsibilities inherent in their professions as teachers, aggrivated with the changing technologies and learning platforms they must learn and utilize, significantly increased their emotional pressure and lowered their quality of life. Teachers’ psychological capital influences how they view life in general, including their performance at work; thus, assessing and gauging it among them makes sense.

This study is anchored on the Self-Determination Theory of Deci and Ryan. It highlights the essentiality of relatedness as a fundamental
psychological need resulting in the healthy functioning of individuals (Ryan and Deci, 2000, 2017). Thus, teachers who feel the emotional connection through love and care from their family members, co-teachers, and stakeholders had already met the need for relatedness.

The second theory is the Conservation of Resources which points out how psychological capital or resources caravan contributes to preserving a person’s subjective well-being as manifested in their physiological, cognitive, and social domains (Hobfoll, 2011; Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu & Westman, 2018). So, a teacher who develops personal resources (e.g., hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism) is more likely to possess the specific abilities and attitudes required to satisfy performance standards and achieve job success.

Another theory related to the study is the Affective Event Theory by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996). It focuses on the crucial role of putting a premium on the employees’ emotions in organizational management. The theory postulates that working circumstances in an organization directly affect their job attitudes, behaviors, and psychological dissatisfaction. Members’ traits regulate the negative impacts it brings on the overall organizational performance. In this case, to achieve optimum organizational performance and effectiveness, managers should consider the emotional reaction of the employees alongside its financial targets.

The fourth theory which guides the researcher is Hans Selye’s, General Adaptation Syndrome. The theory posits that when an event threatens an organism’s well-being (a stressor), a three-stage physical reaction occurs: Alarm (fight or flight reaction phase), Resistance, and Exhaustion. Teachers who are experiencing the ordeals of the teaching profession go through this process. Their reaction to the perceived threat will determine the burden or pressure they feel. Having a high level of psychological capital shields them throughout the process. Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) defined psychological capital as an individual’s sanguine condition of psychological growth.

Hopeful individuals have a high level of positive anticipation, and their energy is directed toward achieving that objective. Such zeal for attaining a certain goal leads to increased levels of involvement (Ouweneel, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & van Wijhe, 2012). Numerous scholars classified hope into two categories: willpower and paths (Snyder & Lopez 2002). Luthans et al. (2007) defined willpower as individuals’ drive and motivation when pursuing a desired goal. Pathways and willpower form a symbiotic dyad
in which the attributes of willpower stimulate the discovery of new paths to achieving the desired objective. This willpower enables the individual to endure and discover an alternate way toward achieving the desired goal regardless of the barriers that may emerge.

Self-efficacy is described as an individual’s motivation to exert the effort necessary to succeed in challenging tasks. Bandura’s (1997) research on self-efficacy showed a connection between an individual’s conviction of personal capacity and the extent to which that belief impacts the activity. Self-efficacy is a concept that is frequently utilized in educational settings and is strongly associated with academic accomplishment. Efficacy beliefs refer to one’s belief or confidence in one’s competence in accomplishing specific tasks (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998). According to Ouweneel et al. (2012), individuals’ self-efficacy beliefs influence their effort and tenacity when presented with challenges and unexpected obstructions. Beas and Salanova (2006) established a relationship between increasing flow or engagement and self-efficacy levels, while Llorens, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova (2007) found a relation between more significant levels of work engagement and greater levels of self-efficacy. According to Irizarry (2002), self-efficacy determines an individual’s belief in their abilities.

According to Akpochafo (2011), there are four critical sources of self-efficacy, as defined by Bandura (1977), which include mastery experience, indirect knowledge, social persuasion, and physiological and emotional states. These sources should all be included in teacher education programs. Additionally, the government must address stressors. For their part, elementary school principals must do all necessary to reduce the stressors exacerbated by their behavior and administrative style. There must be a positive working connection between the teacher and the principal to lessen work-related stress.

Emotional regulation refers to the effort employees make to meet the job’s socioemotional requirements. Three critical techniques for emotional regulation have been identified by researchers: surface acting, deep acting, and actual emotional labor. Surface acting entails feigning the appropriate emotions: those who engage in surface acting do not attempt to feel the feelings they are portraying.

Emotional labor is the jumping-off point for comprehending emotional labor. Hochschild (2003) defined emotion work as any endeavor to alter an individual’s experience or expression of a consciously felt emotion. When individuals are expected to conduct emotional labor as part of their
actual job performance, this is referred to as emotional labor. According to Harmsen, Helms-Lorenz, Maulana, and van Veen (2018), negative emotions and dissatisfaction with friction impact instructors' behavior in the classroom. When stress levels reduce, the connection between instructor and student should improve. It is also critical for instructors to handle disobedient pupils and have a good attitude without feeling pressured by student engagement.

Aziz, Widis, and Wuensch (2018) explored the relationships between surface and deep acting, psychological capital (PsyCap), and the three components of burnout (i.e., emotional weariness, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment). While surface behavior is associated favorably with emotional fatigue and depersonalization, it is associated poorly with personal success. Deep acting was associated with depersonalization and personal success but not with emotional tiredness. PsyCap was shown to be adversely related to emotional weariness and depersonalization but favorably associated with personal achievement. PsyCap is adversely connected with surface behavior, but deep behavior is positively correlated with it. Finally, PsyCap moderated the association between surface acting and emotional tiredness and the association between deep acting and depersonalization and personal success. Identifying the advantages and disadvantages of emotional labor, more especially the surface and deep acting, can result in organizational strategies that benefit both employers and employees. Organizations should invest in tools that boost employees' PsyCap in order to assist workers in overcoming the negative consequences of emotional labor, particularly the components of burnout).

A holistic and rigorous curriculum that assists instructors in regulating and overcoming work-related stress should be given. These are accessible papers that provide context for the current investigation. Numerous research investigations have been conducted to determine the association between teachers’ psychological capital, emotional labor, and stress index.

Jensen (2020) found that psychological capital is positively connected with job satisfaction and dedication but adversely connected with stress and burnout. Thus, a person with a high psychological capital level is more likely to have a better tolerance for stress and will resist burnout more readily. Additionally, a study discovered that teachers’ psychological capital is related to their emotional labor. Their study revealed that teachers with low positive psychological capital commonly engage in emotional labor.
activities in comparison to those who do (Tosten & Toprak, 2017).

Hong and Kim (2019) discovered the impacts of workplace stress, emotional labor, and positive psychological capital on physician assistant work satisfaction in their study (P.A.s). Work stress, positive psychological capital, and overall clinical career were revealed to be significant predictors of P.A. job satisfaction. Thus, it is vital to establish ways for managing the workplace stress that P.A.s face and to reinforce and grow positive psychological capital to increase their job happiness.

Teachers with a high degree of psychological capital and collective self-esteem are better equipped to deal with the current wave of school violence, student/student bullying, and other difficulties plaguing the education system worldwide, regionally, and nationally. A high level of teacher psychological capital in the areas of hope, optimism, self-efficacy, resilience, and collective self-esteem translates into educators who have a more optimistic attitude and can transfer and influence their students’ self-perceptions (Bissessar, 2014).

Psychological capital (PsyCap) is an emerging fundamental concept associated with excellent outcomes at work for individuals. However, DepEd administrators put little emphasis on this aspect through training and interventions. The literature revealed no significant attempt in Bohol Division was made to experimentally evaluate the efficacy of PsyCap development in enhancing teachers’ emotional labor and stress index. Addressing this gap in Bohol Division, the researcher examined the psychological capital, emotional labor, and stress index of Tubigon public school teachers. The study results will pave the way towards recommendations for the betterment of the lives of teachers and ultimately improve learners’ outcomes. Moreover, this study contributes to the fund of human knowledge, particularly on policymaking that would encourage productivity among teachers, one of the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals.

This study aimed to determine the levels of psychological capital, emotional labor, and stress index of public-school teachers in Tubigon Districts, Division of Bohol for the S.Y. 2020-2021 with the end view of proposing an intervention program.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following research question:

1. What is the respondents’ level of psychological capital in terms of hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience?
2. What are the respondents’ levels of emotional labor in terms
of surface acting, deep acting, and expression of naturally felt emotions?

3. What is the respondents’ level of stress index in the context of student behavior, employee-administrative relations, teacher-teacher relations, parent-teacher relations, time management, intrapersonal conflicts, physical symptoms of stress, psychological/emotional symptoms of stress, and stress management techniques?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents’ profile and their level of psychological capital, emotional labor, and stress index?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents’ psychological capital and emotional labor, psychological capital and stress index, and emotional labor and stress index?

6. Is there a significant difference between males and females in psychological capital, emotional labor, and stress index?

METHODOLOGY

The study followed the descriptive-correlational design with the help of a survey tool to gather the necessary data. This design described the variables and the relationships that occur naturally between and among them. The respondents of this study were the 350 public school teachers of the two Districts of Tubigon: Tubigon West and Tubigon East Districts, chosen through purposive sampling technique. The researcher used a four-part questionnaire. The first part asked for their profile. Psychological Capital Questionnaire 24 (PCQ-24), developed by Luthans et al. (2007), was utilized in determining their psychological capital. PCQ-24 has four subscales: hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience, reflecting the underlying dimensions of individuals’ psychological resources. The second adopted questionnaire is the Emotional Labor of Teaching Scale (TELTS, Brown, 2011), which measured the participants’ emotional labor. Lastly, it used the Wilson Stress Profile for Teachers (WSPT, Rosenberg, 2010) for the respondents’ level of stress index. The WSPT is a 36-item self-report stress inventory developed by Dr. C.F. Wilson in 1979 for basic education teachers.

This study underwent an intensive review of the UB Ethics Review Committee members for the certification to conduct the research. The
researcher provided informed consent to address the respondents’ rights, and they can also withdraw anytime if it is against their will. The respondents were adequately informed on all relevant aspects of the study, including its aim and survey procedure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Psychological Capital. Findings revealed that the respondents’ level of psychological capital. All dimensions of psychological capital, namely were rated High. The respondents obtained an overall mean of 3.6352, which means that they possess high level of psychological capital.

Respondents’ Level of Emotional Labor. Emotional labor is defined as putting energy into dealing with the feelings of others, putting them at ease without self-regard, or meeting social expectations. It has three (3) dimensions; surface acting, deep acting and expression of naturally felt emotions. The two (2) of the dimensions were interpreted as high, while the remaining one (1) dimension was rated moderate. Expression of Naturally felt Emotions is in first rank, followed by Deep Acting, and lastly the Surface Acting.

Respondents’ Stress Index. Stress Index has nine (9) dimensions; student behavior, employee-administrative relations, teacher-teacher relations, parent-teacher relations, time management, intrapersonal conflicts, physical symptoms of stress, psychological/emotional symptoms of stress, and stress management techniques.

Findings revealed that teacher-teacher relations and employee-administrative relations were rated very low. Student behavior, intrapersonal conflicts, physical symptoms of stress, psychological/emotional symptoms of stress, and stress management techniques obtained low ratings. Among these dimensions, time management and parent-teacher relations were perceived to have caused a moderate stress index among the participants. In general, they obtained low-stress index. It implies that teachers are experiencing less psychological distress; however, they have issues on time management and parent-teacher relations.

Relationship between Profile and Level of Psychological Capital. Age and Psychological Capital. The statistical analysis using Somers’d Test produced a p-value of .021, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a
significant relationship between the respondents’ age and psychological capital level. It further implies that age is associated with their level of psychological capital.

**Sex and Psychological Capital.** The Pearson Chi-Squared test rendered a p-value of .005, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ sex and their level of psychological capital. It implies that sex has something to do with their psychological capital.

**Civil Status and Psychological Capital.** Using Pearson Chi-Squared test as the statistical analysis, it produced a p-value of .899, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between civil status and level of psychological capital. It implies that being single, married, widowed or separated is not associated with their level of psychological capital. However, the study of Manzano-García and Ayala (2017) is contrary to this result, that on average, the psychological capital of people living with a partner is significantly higher than that of those living alone.

**Religious Affiliation and Psychological Capital.** The statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square test resulted with a p-value of .003, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ religious affiliation and their level of psychological capital. It further implies that their religious affiliation has something to do with their level of psychological capital. Similar to the study of Bano, Wadhera, and Sevak (2017), psychological capital and spiritual transcendence, such as their religious affiliation came out as a significant predictor of quality of life and help sustain profession with positivity.

**Highest Educational Status and Psychological Capital.** The Pearson Chi-Squared test produced a p-value of .053, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between their highest educational status and their level of psychological capital.

**Years of Service and Psychological Capital.** Using Somers’d test as the statistical analysis, it rendered a p-value of .019, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ years of service and their level of psychological capital. It implies that the years of
service is associated with their psychological capital. It corroborates with the study of Lee, Chou, Chin, and Wu (2017), that teachers’ working years demonstrate a significant moderation effect in the causal correlation of psychological capital.

**Relationship between Profile and Emotional Labor.** Age and Emotional Labor. The Somers’d test produced a p-value of .990, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between age and their emotional labor. It implies that their age is not associated with their level of emotional labor. This is in contrast to the study of Cheung and Tang (2010), that showed age was related to the use of deep acting and the expression of naturally felt emotions. Results also showed that the conditional indirect effect of deep acting between age and job satisfaction was significant.

Sex and Emotional Labor. The statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square test rendered a p-value of .007, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ sex and their level of emotional labor. It infers that sex is associated with their emotional labor. This is akin to the study of Cheung, Tang, and Tang (2011), stated that there is a significant effect found both gender groups in relation to their emotional labor.

Civil Status and Emotional Labor. Using Pearson Chi-Square test as the statistical analysis, it rendered a p-value of .278, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between civil status and their level of emotional labor. It indicates that being single, married, widowed or separated is not associated with their level of emotional labor. It is opposite to the study of Khetjenkarn and Agmapisarn (2020), revealed that marital status had both positive and negative effects regarding emotional labor.

Religious Affiliation and Emotional Labor. The Pearson Chi-Square test rendered a p-value of .469, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between religious affiliation and their level of emotional labor. It means that their religious affiliation has nothing to do with their level of emotional labor. However, this is contradictory to the study of Byrne, Morton and Dahling (2011) that stated religion and spirituality shapes the emotions that employees regulate through emotional labor.
Highest Educational Status and Emotional Labor. The statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square test produced a p-value of .036, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ highest educational status and their level of emotional labor. It further implies that their educational status is associated with their level of emotional labor. Likewise, to the study of Zaretsky and Katz (2019) indicated that teachers’ level of education differentially affected the use of specific emotional labor techniques.

Years of Service and Emotional Labor. The Somers’d test produced a p-value of .820, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. There is no significant relationship between the respondents’ years of service and their level of emotional labor. It indicates that their years of service has nothing to do with their emotional labor.

Relationship between Profile and Level of Stress. Age and Level of Stress. The statistical analysis using Somers’d test produced a p-value of .931, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the respondents’ age and their level of stress. It indicated that their age is not associated with their level of stress.

Sex and Level of Stress. The Pearson Chi-Square test rendered a p-value of .313, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between their sex and their level of stress. It means that being male and female has nothing to do with their level of stress.

Civil Status and Level of Stress. Using Pearson Chi-Square test as the statistical analysis produced a p-value of .149, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between their civil status and their level of stress. It indicates that being single, married, widowed or separated is not associated with their level of stress.

Religious Affiliation and Level of Stress. By means of Pearson Chi-Square test, we got the p-value of .000, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ religious affiliation and their level of stress. It implies that religious affiliation is associated with their level of stress. It is akin with the study of Graham, Furr, Flowers and
Burke (2001) that indicated religion and spirituality positively correlated with coping with stress.

**Highest Educational Status and Level of Stress.** The statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square test rendered a p-value of .000, which is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ highest educational status and their level of stress. It infers that their highest educational status has something to do with their level of stress. It corroborates to the study of Agai-Demjaha, Minov, Stolesski and Zafirova (2015) that teachers with high education are more stressful compared to teachers with university education.

**Years of Service and Level of Stress.** Using Somers’d test for the statistical analysis, it produced a p-value of .132, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the respondents’ years of service and their level of stress. It indicates that their years of service has nothing to do with their level of stress. Whereas the study of Violanti (1983), stating that during first 5 years of work, stress will increase as a beginner wherein the work is quite different from what was learned in the academy but as the years in service increases, stress will decrease as they become less career oriented and less reactive to gaps between ideals and reality.

**Relationship between Psychological Capital and Emotional Labor.** The correlational analysis between the respondents’ psychological capital and their emotional labor using Spearman’s rho is presented in Table 1. The p-value of .000 is lesser that the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ psychological capital and their emotional labor. It implies that their psychological capital is associated with their emotional labor.

**Table 1. Correlation between Psychological Capital and Emotional Labor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r_s$</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Decision on $H_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital and Emotional Labor</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

It runs parallel to the study of Aziz, Widis, and Wuensch (2018), indicated that psychological capital is negatively correlated with emotional...
exhaustion and depersonalization but positively correlated with personal accomplishment as well as the study of Tosten and Toprak (2017) that revealed that psychological capital of teacher as something to do with their emotional labor. Likewise, the study of Rahimnia, Mazidi, and Mohamadzadeh (2013) indicated high psychological capital increases the person’s constructive emotions and reduces destructive emotions. It is also akin to Yin, Wang, Huang, and Li (2018). Their findings suggest that psychological capital generally plays a positive role in the emotion regulation process.

**Relationship between Psychological Capital and Level of Stress.** The correlational analysis between the respondents’ psychological capital and their level of stress using Spearman’s rho is illustrated in Table 2. The p-value of .000 is lesser than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, the finding rejected the null hypothesis. It means that there is a significant relationship between the respondents’ psychological capital and their stress level, and it infers that psychological capital is associated with their stress level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r_s</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Decision on H₀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital and Level of Stress</td>
<td>-.234**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

This finding resembles the study of Demir (2018), indicating that as teachers’ psychological capitals increase, their stress levels decrease. In their study, Riolli, Savicki, and Richards (2012) also stated that psychological capital buffered the impact of stress so that the relationship between stress and adverse outcomes was reduced.

**Relationship between the Emotional Labor and Level of Stress.** The correlational analysis between the respondents’ emotional labor and their stress level using Spearman’s rho is presented in Table 3. The p-value of .053 is more significant than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. It means that there is no significant relationship between the respondents’ emotional labor and their stress level. Hence, emotional labor is not associated with their level of stress.
Table 3. Correlation between Emotional Labor and Level of Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Spearman’s rho Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Decision on $H_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor and Level of Stress</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is in contrast to the study of Sohn, Park, Park, Hwang, Choi, Lee, and Jung (2018), concluding that surface acting during emotional labor was positively correlated with job stress. Also with the study of Pugliesi (1999) indicating that emotional labor increases perceptions of job stress, decreases satisfaction, and increases distress. As well as the study of Hochschild (2003) showing the discrepancy between felt and expressed emotion is related to job stress and burnout. Another study that contrasts to this are the study of Adegoke (2014) that surveyed the impact of stress which had a significant impact on frustration and depression of employees.

**Difference between Sex and Psychological Capital.** The difference between the respondents’ sex and their psychological capital using Mann-Whitney U is illustrated in Table 4. The p-value of .002 is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected. It means that there is a significant difference in the respondents’ psychological capital when grouped into their sex profile. The findings showed that males have higher psychological capital compared to females.

Table 4. Nonparametric Test between Sex and Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Decision on $H_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex and Psychological Capital</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>213.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>169.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatively, the study of Rani and Chaturvedula (2018) stating that there is no evidence found to support the sex difference in psychological capital.
**Difference between Sex and Emotional Labor.** The difference between the respondents’ sex profile and their level of emotional labor using the Mann-Whitney U is presented in Table 5. The p-value of .001 is lesser than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it rejects the null hypothesis. It means that there is a significant difference in the respondents’ level of emotional labor when grouped into their sex profile. The findings show that males have higher emotional labor compared to females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Decision on H₀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex and Emotional Labor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>214.62</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the study of Erickson and Ritter (2001) stated that in emotional labor, in gender these do not differ.

**Difference between Sex and Level of Stress.** The difference between the respondents’ sex profile and their level of stress using Mann-Whitney U is illustrated in Table 6. The p-value of .305 is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus, it failed to reject the null hypothesis. It means that there is no significant difference in the respondents’ level of stress when grouped according to their sex profile. Hence, their sex profile had nothing to do with their level of stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Decision on H₀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex and Level of Stress</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>168.73</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>176.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding is in contrast to the study of Calvarese (2015) indicated that in her research, significant differences were found between males and females concerning their reactions to stress. She stated that more females experienced a higher level of depression, frustration, and anxiety than their male counterparts.
CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following salient points were drawn:

Among the profile variables, only the respondents’ age, sex, religious affiliation, and years of service have a significant relationship with psychological capital. Profile as to sex and highest educational status has a substantial connection with emotional labor. The teacher respondents’ profiles, such as religious affiliation and highest educational status, significantly correlated with the stress index. There was a significant relationship between the respondents’ psychological capital and their emotional labor and psychological capital and stress index. There was no significant relationship between the respondents’ emotional labor and stress index. Psychological capital varies when aggregated according to sex. There was a significant difference in the respondents’ emotional labor when grouped according to profile.

Furthermore, there was no significant difference in the respondents’ stress levels when classified according to sex.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following measures are recommended:

1. Enhance the least rated aspects of psychological capital, particularly optimism, by conducting Mental Health Management seminars.
2. School administrators should conduct strategic planning through IPCiRF and religiously follow its phases, namely: (1) performance planning and commitment, (2) performance monitoring and coaching, (3) performance review and evaluation, (4) performance rewarding and development planning to lessen teachers’ stress index.
3. Enhance the respondents’ interpersonal development through psychospiritual seminars and team-building activities.
4. School administrators must build a good rapport and show support to the teacher to lessen their burdens.
5. An intensive seminar workshop on time management should be conducted among teachers and administrators.
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