Analyzing Stress Levels and Stress Factors among Malaysian Teachers While Working from Home during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Hasjazura Hassan[a], Ku Suhaila Ku Johari[b], Salleh Amat [c]

[a] Doctoral Student of Centre of the Learner Diversity & Education, Faculty of Education, National University of Malaysia.
[b] Assistant Professor of Centre of the Learner Diversity & Education, Faculty of Education, National University of Malaysia.
[c] Associate Professor of Centre of the Learner Diversity & Education, Faculty of Education, National University of Malaysia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the stress levels and stress factors among Malaysian teachers by working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. This study adopted the quantitative method and was measured according to the Teacher Stress Inventory, 20 questions for stress levels measurement and 41 questions for stress factors measurement. Data were collected in May and June 2021, after one and a half years in the COVID-19 pandemic. 150 teachers in Malaysian voluntarily participated in this study. Data were analyzed by Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. The results showed the stress level among Malaysian teachers were low (mean = 1.94, SD = 0.588) and stress factors were relationships with students' parents, relationships among co-workers, workload, time constraints, student motivation, appreciation and support, and lack of resources among Malaysian teachers were low level (mean = 2.26, SD = 0.618). This showed that teachers can manage and control their stress while working from home. They do not have to go to school. Results of this study could be used by school administrators and teachers, to optimize their home workspace and eventually to improve their mental well-being. Future research should include a more representative distribution of males and female teachers by using other instruments to gain understandings of the stress, anxiety, and depression during COVID-19.

Keywords: Pandemic COVID-19, teacher, working from home, factors, stress.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has led, worldwide, to an extraordinary situation, that suddenly obliged millions of people to work from home **(J. Oakman et al 2020)**. In early 2020, the world was shaken by the spread of a new virus, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) and the disease is called Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Originally

from Wuhan, China found in late December 2019 and so far, 65 countries have been infected with the virus, WHO data, March 1, 2020 **(Relman, 2020)** until this time **(Yuliana, 2020)**. Based on data from the Ministry of Health Malaysia 2021 dated 1 April 2021, there are a total of COVID-19 patients in Malaysia reached 345,500 cases. The increase in the number of COVID-19 has been a concern for all parties, including Prime Minister Tan Sri Muhyiddin Yassin and the Malaysian Minister of Education. Prime Minister Tan Sri Muhyiddin Yassin gave instructions to close various educational institutions including in terms of primary and secondary education and Higher Education such as Universities and others **(Daily News, 2020)**. With this, there has been a change in teaching and learning (PdP) in any educational institution in the world without the exception of Malaysia. Before the advent of COVID-19, 90% of PdP was implemented face to face, but after the advent of COVID-19, it changed to full online that is teaching and learning from home (PdPR) **(Mohamed, 2020; Arwansyah et al., 2021; Evy Aldiyah, 2021)** by using Google Classroom **(Su & Mohd, 2020; Noor Desiro & Harzati, 2021)**. This also has led teachers to a massive switch from working at the school to working from home full-time to minimize the spread of the virus. One of the main challenges while working from home, are workspace distraction that might also affect teachers' mental health.

These new work arrangements have several implications for people's mental health **(M. Douglas, 2020)**. While immediate reactions to workspace stressors can result in short-term, reversible consequences, repeated, long-term exposure to such stressors could potentially cause stress complaints. Here, stress is defined as the objective stressors that mentally affect an individual **(P. Jimenez & A. Dunkl, 2017).** The teaching profession is burdened with high social responsibility **(Karina Wengel-Wozny et al., 2015; Syed Sufian Syed Salim, 2010)** and teachers' careers always deal with pupils **(Karina Wengel-Wozny et al., 2015; Chin Mei Keong, 2015)** to build the best relationship with them and good self-emotional manage during the pandemic, especially while working from home during teaching and learning at home (PdPR). Job stress is the main factor for the organization productivity and qualitive and individual job image impact especially for teachers' biological, psychological and spiritual disturbance whereas teacher stress is a specific form of stress within the school context **(Nathaniel Von Der Embse et al., 2019)**.

 Stress can be expressed in two terms namely, mental stress and physical stress **(Hong Ji, 2011; Syezreen Dalina et al., 2021)**. It refers to the process of cognitive and behavioral experience by both sources of mental stress and reaction. The hole in **Sukoco (2014)** states that stress is divided into two namely, distress and eustress. Negative stressful behaviors are referred to as distress that can disrupt individuals and lead to harm while positive stress called eustress is what motivates a person. A person with stress has several symptoms that are either objective or subjective. **Murtaza (2015)** states that stress is divided into three stages, namely acute stress, episodic stress, and chronic stress. Acute stress occurs when a person has a new set of demands, pressures and expectations that are beyond the level of self-stimulation beyond anxiety, frustration and hostility, episodes of stress occur when criteria such as acute stress occur more frequently and continued with various episodes such as heart disease, chest pain, fatigue, high blood pressure and headache while chronic stress is the accumulation of chronic stress characters such as family problems, poverty, chronic illness and work stress.

In addition, a study conducted by the National Teachers Service Union, NUTP (2017) found that 70% of 9000 teachers in Malaysia had experienced stress. Thus, teacher stress is also a global phenomenon **(Ignat & Clipa, 2012; Neves de Jesus et al., 2014; Clipa & Boghean, 2015; Clipa, 2018; Michael E. Bernard, 2016; Kitchen et al., 2017; Christopher Mccarthy, Richard Lambert & Paul G Fitchett, 2018; Abiodun, 2019)** and to this day remains a study and discussion of ways to help and reduce the number of teachers who are under stress. But while the COVID-19 pandemic has led worldwide to an extraordinary situation, that suddenly teachers do teaching and learning from home and stress under control were proposed using various stress management techniques **(Syezreen Dalina et al., 2021)**.

2. Significance of The Study

Although working from home (WFH) has several benefits including having more time with family and less commuting time, it also has several known disadvantages, such as blurred lines between personal and professional life **(Hoffman, 2020)**. People who work from home tend to work longer and more continuous hours **(Bubonya et al., 2017)** and may experience more workspace distractions than they would at the office **(Baethgeetl, 2015)**. According to **Lee and Brand (2005)**, work distraction refers to the extent to which workers are disturbed or irritated by negative or undesirable stimuli at the workplace. Personal characteristics might also have an effect. For instance, studies have shown that an individual's personality could affect their perception of distractions at the workspace and their stress levels **(Grant & Langan-fox, 2007; Oseland & Hodsman, 2018)**. Furthermore, **Quick et al. (2017)** suggested that gender differences exist in how (much) people respond to work-related stressors. In open-plan office settings, it was found that males have a more positive perception of office conditions than females, which might indicate that females are more prone to workspace distractions than males **(Yildirim et al., 2007)**. Although previous studies have shown how distractions in the office could lead to negative effects on workers' well-being **(Keller et al., 2020)**, still little is known about distractions while working from home, and how they affect people's mental health (i.e. stress and burnout symptoms). Therefore, this study aims to analyze stress levels and stress factors among Malaysian teachers while working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. The significance of this research is to analyze stress levels and stress factors among Malaysian teachers while working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic.

3.Review of Related Studies

In addition, a study conducted by the National Teachers Service Union, NUTP (2017) found that 70% of 9000 teachers in Malaysia had experienced stress. Thus, teacher stress is also a global phenomenon **(Ignat & Clipa, 2012; Neves de Jesus et al., 2014; Clipa & Boghean, 2015; Clipa, 2018; Michael E. Bernard, 2016; Kitchen et al., 2017; Christopher Mccarthy, Richard Lambert & Paul G Fitchett, 2018; Abiodun, 2019)** and to this day remains a study and discussion of ways to help and reduce the number of teachers who are under stress. But while the COVID-19 pandemic has led worldwide to an extraordinary situation, that suddenly teachers do teaching and learning from home and stress under control were proposed using various stress management techniques **(Syezreen Dalina et al., 2021)**.

4. Objectives of The Study

- To identify the level of stress teachers.
- To identify the main factors of teacher stress.
- To identify whether there is any significance difference in teacher stress levels according to demographics (i) Gender (ii) Age (iii) Teaching Experience.
- To identify whether there is any significant difference in teacher stress factors according to demographics (i) Gender (ii) Age (iii) Teaching Experience.

5. Hypotheses of The Study

- The level of stress teachers.
- The main factors of teacher stress
- There is no significant difference in teacher stress levels according to demographics (i) Gender (ii) Age (iii) Teaching Experience.
- There is no significant difference in teacher stress factors according to demographics (i) Gender (ii) Age (iii) Teaching Experience.

6. Population and Sample

The respondents of this study consisted of 150 teachers who were selected at simple random by answering questions in google form online, data were collected in May and June 2021, during the COVID-19 pandemic.

6.1. Statistical Techniques Used in the Present Study

This study used a quantitative method using a research design survey. The demographic information is gender, age, race, school type, marital status, teaching experience, and highest academic qualifications. It was measured according to the Teacher Stress Inventory developed by Boyle et al. (1995) which was modified by Mokhtar (1998), Mazlan (2002) and Tee Sook Kim (2006) which distinguishes. Data was analyzed by Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. Stress level is measured with 5 levels namely, N = Never, R = Rarely, S = Sometimes, QO = Quite Often, O = Often, while for stress factor is measured through 5 levels namely, Very Low, Low, Medium, High and Very High. In this study, teacher stress factors were measured by 7 dimensions namely relationships with students' parents, relationships among co-workers, workload, time constraints, student motivation, appreciation and support, and lack of resources which indicates that the sum score could be used. The reliability range for the teacher stress factor dimension was between 0.797 to 0.947 while the Cronbach's alpha for the overall teacher stress level and teacher stress factor was 0.947 (20 items) and 0.970 (41 items), respectively. Thus, it shows that the instruments used have high reliability and are acceptable.

6.2. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table.1. Showing the demographic information such as shows gender, age, race, school type, marital status, teaching experience and highest academic qualifications.

Variables	Variable Category	N	%
Gender	Male	67	44.7
	Female	83	55.3
Age	25 years – 34 years	35	23.3
	35 years – 44 years	77	51.3
	45 years – 54 years	38	25.3
Race	Malays	118	78.7
	Chinese	19	12.7
	Indians.	13	8.7
School type	Primary Schools	125	83.3
	Secondary Schools	25	16.7
Marital status	Single	17	11.3
	Married	133	88.7
Teaching experience	6 to 10 years	33	22.0
	11 to 15 years	50	33.3
	16 to 20 years	27	18.0
	over 20 years	40	26.7
Highest academic qualifications	Diploma	7	4.7
	Degree	126	84.0
	Master's Degree	17	11.3

Note. N-150

Interpretation of table-1.

Data showed that 44.7 percent (67 people) were male teachers, while 55.3 percent (83 people) were female teachers. As for the age group, 35 years - 44 years consists of 51.3% (77 people), followed by 45 years - 54 years which is 25.3% (38 people) and 25 years - 34 years which is 23.3% (35 people). While, Malays consists of 118 patients (78.7%), followed by 19 Chinese (12.7%) and 13 Indians (8.7%). A total of 125 people (83.3%) were from Primary Schools, while a total of 25 people (16.7%) were from Secondary Schools. As for marital status, a total of 17 people (11.3%) were single, while the remaining 133 people (88.7%) were married. A total of 33 people (22.0%) are from 6 to 10 years, a total of 50 people (33.3%) from 11 to 15 years, a total of 27 people (18.0%) from 16 to 20 years and the remaining 40 people (26.7%) than over 20 years. For the highest academic qualifications, a total of 7 people (4.7%) had a Diploma, 126 people (84.0%) had a Degree and a total of 17 people (11.3%) had a Master's degree.

Table.2. Teacher stress level.

	N	Mean	SP	Level
Teacher Stress	150	1.94	.588	Low

Interpretation of table-2.
There is no Stress levels were measured with 5 Likert scales namely N = Never, R = Rarely, S = Sometimes, QO = Quiet Often, O = Often (Level: Very low = 1.00-1.89, Low = 1.90-2.69, Moderate = 2.70 - 3.49, High = 3.50 - 4.29, Very high = 4.30 - 5.00). In this study, teachers' stress levels were measured using 20 items. As shown in Table 2, the stress level score (mean = 1.94, SP = 0.588) among teachers during COVID-19 pandemic is low.

Table.3. Mean values and standard deviation of teacher stress factors.

Dimension	Mean	SP	Level
Relationships with students' parents	2.05	.759	Low
Relationships among colleagues	1.73	.592	Very low
Workload	2.48	.753	Low
Time constraints	2.53	.831	Low
Student motivation	2.55	.814	Low
Appreciation and support	2.12	.781	Low
Lack of resources	2.38	.864	Low
Overall (Teachers stress factor)	**2.26**	**.618**	**Low**

(Level: Very Low = 1.00 - 1.89, Low = 1.90 - 2.69, Medium = 2.70 - 3.49, High = 3.50 - 4.29, Very High = 4.30 - 5.00)

Interpretation of table-3.
There is in this study, teacher stress factors were measured by 7 dimensions, namely relationships with students' parents, relationships among colleagues, workload, time constraints, student motivation, appreciation and support, and lack of resources. Table 3 shows that the relationship score among colleagues (mean = 1.73, SP = 0.592) is at a very low level. Low score is seen for the rest of the 6 dimensions, which are the relationship with parents of students (mean = 2.05, SP = 0.759), workload (mean = 2.48, SP = 0.753), time constraints (mean = 2.53, SP = 0.831), because of students (mean = 2.55, SP = 0.814), appreciation and support (mean = 2.12, SP = 0.781), and lack of resources (mean = 2.38, SP = 0.864). Overall, the stress factor score (mean = 2.26, SP = 0.618) among teachers is at a low level.

Table.4. T-test Difference in teacher stress levels by gender.

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig.
Teacher	StressMale	67	1.82	.607	-2.102	.037
Levels	Female	83	2.02	.560		

Interpretation of table-4.
The finding is to answer the third objective of this study which is to identify the differences in the level of teacher stress according to the demographics of the respondents. Based on the results of the t-test shown in Table 4, it is found that there is a significant difference in the level of teacher stress (t = -2.102, p = 0.037, p <0.05) according to gender. These findings also show

that the level of stress among female teachers (mean = 2.02, SD = 0.560) is higher than male teachers (mean = 1.82, SD = 0.607).

Table.5. One-Way ANOVA of Differences in Teacher Stress Levels by Age and Teaching Experience.

		JKD	DK	MKD	F	Sig.
Teacher Stress Levels Age	Between Groups	.754	2	.377	1.091	.339
	In Group	50.834	147	.346		
	Total	51.589	149			
Teaching Experience	Between Groups	1.123	3	.374	1.083	.358
	In Group	50.465	146	.346		
	Total	51.589	149			

Interpretation of table-5.

Table 5 is based on the results of one-way ANOVA that there is no significant difference in the level of teacher stress (F (2, 147) = 1.091, p = 0.339, p > 0.05) according to age. This suggests that age did not play a significant role as there was no difference in teachers' stress levels. There was no significant difference in teacher stress levels (F (3, 146) = 1.083, p = 0.358, p > 0.05) according to teaching experience. This suggests that teaching experience does not play a significant role as there is no difference in teachers' stress levels.

Table.6. T-Test Differences of Teacher Stress Factors by Gender.

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig.
Relationship with parents of students	Male	67	1.93	.769	-1.730	.086
	Female	83	2.14	.742		
peer relationships	Male	67	1.69	.569	-.651	.516
	Female	83	1.76	.612		
workload	Male	67	2.40	.789	-1.189	.237
	Female	83	2.54	.721		
time constraint	Male	67	2.35	.846	-2.420	.017
	Female	83	2.67	.794		
because students	Male	67	2.44	.783	-1.491	.138
	Female	83	2.64	.832		
appreciation and support	Male	67	2.03	.819	-1.234	.219
	Female	83	2.19	.746		
resource scarcity	Male	67	2.41	.904	.450	.653
	Female	83	2.35	.835		
Teacher stress factors	**Male**	**67**	**2.18**	**.654**	**-1.472**	**.143**
	Female	**83**	**2.33**	**.583**		

Interpretation of table-6.

The result of this study is to answer the fourth objective of the study which is to identify the differences in teacher stress factors according to gender. Based on the results of t-test as shown in Table 6, it is found that there was no significant difference in teacher stress factors in terms of relationship with students' parents (t = -1.730, p = 0.086, p > 0.05), peer relationships (t = 0.651, p = 0.516, p > 0.05), workload (t = 1.189, p = 0.237, p > 0.05) because students (t = 1.491, p = 0.138, p > 0.05), appreciation and support (t = 1.234, p = 0.219, p > 0.05), and resource scarcity (t = 0.450, p = 0.653, p > 0.05) by gender. This indicates that gender does not play a significant role because there is no difference in teacher stress factors in terms of relationships with students' parents, relationships among colleagues, workload, student motivation, appreciation and support, and lack of resources.

However, there was a significant difference of teacher stress factors from the aspect of time constraints (t = 2.420, p = 0.017, p < 0.05) according to gender. These findings also show that the teacher stress factor from the aspect of time constraints among female teachers (mean = 2.67, SD = 0.794) is higher than male teachers (mean = 2.35, SD = 0.846). Overall, it is shown that there was no significant difference of teacher stress factors (t = 1.472, p = 0.143, p > 0.05) by gender. Thus, it can be summarized that gender does not play a significant role as there is no difference in teacher stress factors.

Table.7. One-Way ANOVA of Teacher Stress Factor Differences by Age.

		JKD	DK	MKD	F	Sig.
relationship with parents of students	Between Groups	.640	2	.320	.552	.577
	In Group	85.224	147	.580		
	Total	85.864	149			
peer relationships	Between Groups	.774	2	.387	1.106	.334
	In Group	51.464	147	.350		
	Total	52.238	149			
workload	Between Groups	.627	2	.314	.549	.578
	In Group	83.919	147	.571		
	Total	84.547	149			
time constraint	Between Groups	.368	2	.184	.264	.768
	In Group	102.451	147	.697		
	Total	102.819	149			
because students	Between Groups	.725	2	.363	.544	.581
	In Group	97.940	147	.666		
	Total	98.665	149			
appreciation and support	Between Groups	.012	2	.006	.010	.990
	In Group	90.772	147	.617		
	Total	90.784	149			
resource scarcity	Between Groups	.723	2	.361	.480	.620
	In Group	110.621	147	.753		
	Total	111.344	149			

Teacher stress factors	**Between Groups**	**.125**	**2**	**.062**	**.161**	**.851**
	In Group	**56.826**	**147**	**.387**		
	Total	**56.951**	**149**			

Interpretation of table-7.

The result of this study is to answer the fifth objective of the study which is to identify the differences in teacher stress factors according to age. Based on the results of one-way analysis of variance as shown in Table 7, it is found that there is no significant difference of teacher stress factors in terms of relationship with parents of students ($F (2, 147) = 0.552$, $p = 0.577$, $p > 0.05$), peer relationships ($F (2, 147) = 1.106$, $p = 0.334$, $p > 0.05$), workload ($F (2, 147) = 0.549$, $p = 0.578$, $p > 0.05$), time constraint ($F (2, 147) = 0.264$, $p = 0.768$, $p > 0.05$), because students ($F (2, 147) = 0.544$, $p = 0.581$, $p > 0.05$), appreciation and support ($F (2, 147) = 0.010$, $p = 0.990$, $p > 0.05$), and resource scarcity ($F (2, 147) = 0.480$, $p = 0.620$, $p > 0.05$) by age. This indicates that age does not play a significant role because there is no difference in teacher stress factors in terms of relationships with students' parents, relationships among colleagues, workload, time constraints, because of students, appreciation and support, and lack of resources. Overall, this shows that there was no significant difference of teacher stress factors ($F (2, 147) = 0.161$, $p = 0.851$, $p > 0.05$) by age. Thus, it can be summarized that age does not play a significant role as it has no difference in teacher stress factors.

Table.8. One-Way ANOVA of Teacher Stress Factor Differences According to Teaching Experience.

		JKD	DK	MKD	F	Sig.
relationship with parents of students	Between Groups	.746	3	.249	.427	.734
	In Group	85.118	146	.583		
	Total	85.864	149			
peer relationships	Between Groups	1.389	3	.463	1.330	.267
	In Group	50.849	146	.348		
	Total	52.238	149			
workload	Between Groups	2.088	3	.696	1.232	.300
	In Group	82.459	146	.565		
	Total	84.547	149			
time constraint	Between Groups	3.933	3	1.311	1.935	.126
	In Group	98.886	146	.677		
	Total	102.819	149			
because students	Between Groups	2.622	3	.874	1.329	.267
	In Group	96.043	146	.658		
	Total	98.665	149			
appreciation and support	Between Groups	3.312	3	1.104	1.843	.142
	In Group	87.472	146	.599		
	Total	90.784	149			
	Between Groups	7.484	3	2.495	3.507	.017

resource scarcity	In Group	103.860	146	.711		
	Total	111.344	149			
Teacher stress factors	**Between Groups**	**2.522**	**3**	**.841**	**2.255**	**.084**
	In Group	**54.429**	**146**	**.373**		
	Total	**56.951**	**149**			

Interpretation of table-8.

The result of this study is to answer the sixth objective of this study which is to identify the differences in teacher stress factors according to teaching experience. Based on the results of one-way analysis of variance as shown in Table 8, it is found that there is no significant difference of teacher stress factors in terms of relationship with parents of students ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 0.427, p = 0.734, p > 0.05), peer relationships ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 1.330, p = 0.267, p > 0.05), workload ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 1.232, p = 0.300, p > 0.05), time constraint ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 1.935, p = 0.126, p > 0.05), because students ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 1.329, p = 0.267, p > 0.05), and appreciation and support ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 1.843, p = 0.142, p > 0.05) according to teaching experience. This indicates that teaching experience does not play a significant role because there is no difference in teacher stress factors in terms of relationships with students' parents, relationships among colleagues, workload, time constraints, student motivation, and appreciation and support. Overall, this shows that there is no significant difference of teacher stress factors ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 2.255, p = 0.084, p > 0.05) according to teaching experience. Thus, it can be summarized that teaching experience does not play a significant role as there is no difference in teacher stress factors.

Table.9. Tukey Post-Hoc Test of Teacher Stress Factors from the Aspect of Lack of Resources According to Teaching Experience.

		N	Mean	SD	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	16 to 20 years	Over 20 years
resource scarcity	**6 to 10 years**	33	2.51	.887		-.037	.582*	.151
	11 to 15 years	50	2.55	.950	.037		.619*	.189
	16 to 20 years	27	1.93	.616	-.582*	-.619*		-.430
	over 20 years	40	2.36	.794	-.151	-.189	.430	

*p < 0.05

Interpretation of table-9.

There was a significant difference in teacher stress factors from the aspect of lack of resources ($F_{(3, 146)}$ = 3.507, p = 0.017, p < 0.05) according to teaching experience. Next, Tukey's post-hoc test was conducted to identify teacher stress factors from the aspect of lack of resources according to different teachers' teaching experiences. The results of Tukey's post-hoc test as

in Table 9 showed that there is a significant mean difference $p < 0.05$ in teacher stress factor from the aspect of lack of resources between the group of experienced teachers 6 to 10 years (mean = 2.51, SD = 0.887) with experienced teachers 16 up to 20 years (mean = 1.93, SD = 0.616), and also between the group of teachers with 11 to 15 years of experience (mean = 2.55, SD = 0.950) with teachers with 16 to 20 years of experience (mean = 1.93, SD = 0.616).

7. Results, Discussion and Recommendations

These results indicate that distractions play a major role in the level of stress complaints while WFH. While workspace distractions were found to cause stress, results also indicated that they increased employees' engagement from the job. It could be that some stimulation, caused by workspace distractions, is necessary for people to perform better, to stay motivated and to keep engaged in their job. Such argumentation is in line with the Yerkes-Dodson law (N. Kwallek et al., 1997).

In this study, teachers stress levels were measured by 20 items. One item had a moderate score, nine items had a low score and another ten items had a very low score. Overall, it is showed that the stress level score (mean = 1.94, SD = 0.588) among teachers is low while working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on Hopkins (2014) study, conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic, teachers' experience of dealing with various negative behaviors in a school setting such as disciplinary problems, low motivation towards academics and learning can impact teachers' stress to the level of affecting mental and physical health and well-being but it is not happening now because students are at home and become more responsible and supervised by their parents. In this study, the stress factor score (mean = 2.26, SD = 0.618) among teachers is at a low level. Suhaimi (2020) supports his findings that the influence of a teacher's workload is low in influencing work stress among teachers. Time constraints are also low because time constraints in the context of education refer to time constraints or the need to perform various tasks or responsibilities in limited time in school then have to continue tasks outside school hours such as solving student discipline problems and limited rest time (Suhaimi, 2020). Teachers only implement teaching and learning at home only during this pandemic and are not involved with the issue of time constraints. This is supported by Lee (2020), where teachers can directly monitor assignments submitted by students through the Google classroom application where it provides the facility to mark assignments more efficiently and teachers' assignments become easier compared to previous practice of having to bring exercise books home to check or return home late from school, to bookmark exercise books or student assignments. This shows that teachers while working from home, can reduce things related to the 7 dimensions that can cause stress as well.

Stress levels among female teachers (mean = 2.02, SD = 0.560) were higher than male teachers (mean = 1.82, SD = 0.607). This is due to task of female teachers also as housewives when working from home compared to male teachers. However, female teachers can still control their stress as they work from home while managing children and family. They get good social support from their children, husbands and families because social support can protect against

too demanding work situations and is consequently important for a well-functioning workplace (Stefan et al., 2020).

The results of the study in identifying differences in stress levels by age found that there were no significant differences in teachers' stress levels (F (2, 147) = 1.091, p = 0.339, p > 0.05) by age. This suggests that age does not play a significant role as there was no difference in teachers' stress levels. The results of the study in identifying differences in teachers' stress levels according to teaching experience found no significant differences in teachers' stress levels (F (3, 146) = 1.083, p = 0.358, p > 0.05) according to teaching experience. This suggests that teaching experience does not play a significant role as there is no difference in teachers' stress levels. Stefan et al. (2020) found that working under good conditions can have a positive impact on our health. Future research should include a more representative distribution of males and females teachers by using other instruments to gain understandings of stress, anxiety, and depression during COVID-19.

Finally, stress often occurs in life and is very closely related to lifestyle practices, one's behavior, family problems, development in the graying process and the shock of life changes in new norms at this time of the pandemic.

8. Conclusion

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, teachers were obliged to work from home (teaching and learning at home), which led to considerable changes in employees' work settings and behaviors (KPM, 2020). This research explains the influence of distractions while working from home on teachers' stress levels is low. This contributes to existing theory by studying the relationships between stress levels and stress factors mediated by perceived workspace distractions at home. It also shows the way people initiate, implement and monitor their emotional processes in order to reach more desirable states, has a significant impact on stress levels. Although this research provided some valuable new insights on the importance of distractions at home for teachers and school administrators, there are a couple of limitations. First, the study was based on a rather small sample that was generated among teachers, with a lot of female teachers.

 For future research, it would be interesting to collect data, using a more heterogeneous sample, among multiple subjects' teachers in different types of schools, to increase the generalizability of the results. Second, an overrepresentation of female respondents with a regular job rank occurred in the sample. Third, should include a more representative distribution of males and females, to gain understandings of the importance of gender during work from home, anxiety, and depression. Fourth, it is recommended that longitudinal study be used along with observations of the same subjects over a period of time and fifth, to measure the effect of stress, researchers can detect developments or changes in the characteristics of the target population at both group and individual levels. According to Ngui and Lay (2015), self-efficacy and well-being play an important role in helping to control and address resilience to work stress factors experienced. Next, Ouellette et.al (2018) suggests that organizational climate and close relationships as well as collaboration between colleagues potentially provide a good environment and job satisfaction. Overall, this study showed the significant role of stress

factors in the relationships between stress levels and working from home. Results of this study could be used by school administrators and teachers, to optimize their home workspace and eventually to improve their mental well-being.

References (APA)

[1]. Aldiyah, E. (2021). Perubahan gaya belajar di masa pandemi COVID-19. *CENDEKIA: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan*, *1*(1), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.51878/cendekia.v1i1.24

[2]. Baethge, A., Rigotti, T., & Roe, R. A. (2014). Just more of the same, or different? An integrative theoretical framework for the study of cumulative interruptions at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *24*(2), 308–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2014.897943.

[3]. Berita Harian. Sedia Hadapi Kelas Maya Sesuai Norma Baharu. (2020, April 19). *Berita Harian*. Https://www.bharian.com.my/berita/nasional/2020/04/679003/sedia-hadapi-kelas-maya-sesuai-normal-baharu.

[4]. Bernard, M. E. (2016). *The strength of self-acceptance: Theory, practice and research*. Springer.

[5]. Bubonya, M., Cobb-Clark, D. A., & Wooden, M. (2017). Mental health and productivity at work: Does what you do matter? *Labour Economics*, *46*, 150–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2017.05.001

[6]. Channel News Asia. (2020, January 28). *Wuhan virus outbreak: 15 medical workers infected, 1 in critical condition*. Channel News Asia. https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/wuhanpneumonia-outbreak-health-workers-coronavirus-12294212.

[7]. Clipa, O. (2018). Teacher stress and coping strategies. *15th Edition of the International Conference on Sciences of Education, Studies and Current Trends in Science of Education, ICSED 2017, 9-10 June 2017, Suceava (Romania)*. https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.icsed2017.14

[8]. Grant, S., & Langan-Fox, J. (2007). Personality and the occupational stressor-strain relationship: The role of the big five. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*(1), 20–33. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.20

[9]. Hoffman, K. E., Garner, D., Koong, A. C., & Woodward, W. A. (2020). Understanding the Intersection of Working from Home and Burnout to Optimize Post-COVID19 Work Arrangements in Radiation Oncology. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*, *108*(2), 370–373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2020.06.062

[10]. Hopkins, M. L. (2014). *The sources of work stress and coping resources for high school teachers in the Gauteng province within different career stages* (dissertation).

[11]. Ignat, A. A., & Clipa, O. (2012). Teachers' satisfaction with life, job satisfaction and their emotional intelligence. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *33*, 498–502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.171.

[12]. Jimenez, P., & Dunkl, A. (2017). The buffering effect of Workplace resources on the relationship between the areas of Worklife and burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00012

[13]. Kamarudin, S. B., & Taat, M. S. (2020). Pengaruh Faktor-faktor tekanan kerja dalam kalangan guru di Sekolah Menengah: Satu analisis persamaan struktur (SEM-PLS). *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, *5*(11), 104–115. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v5i11.544

[14]. Keller, A. C., Meier, L. L., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2019). Please wait until I am done! longitudinal effects of work interruptions on employee well-being. *Work & Stress*, *34*(2), 148–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2019.1579266.

[15]. Kementerian Kesihatan Malaysia. (2021). *19 Malaysia Updates*. COVID. http://covid-19.moh.gov.my/terkini.

[16]. Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, Manual Pengajaran Dan Pembelajaran Di Rumah1–9 (2020)..

[17]. Kim, N. G., & Fah, L. Y. (2015). Relationship between stress coping factors with stress level during practical training among trainee teachers: A PLS-SEM approach. In *Proceeding ICE Brunei 2015*

[18]. Kirin, A., Ahmad Sharifuddin, Mohd Hisyam Abdul Rahim, Shakila Ahmad, Sharifah Khadijah, & Abdullah Sulaiman. (2021). - Impak Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Secara Online: Kajian Kes Terhadap Pelajar Sekolah Rendah, Menengah dan Universiti Semasa Pandemik Covid-19: -. *Advances in Humanities and Contemporary Studies*, *2*(1), 127-136.

[19]. Kitchen, P. J. (2017). Integrated marketing communications. Evolution, current status, future developments. *European Journal of Marketing*, *51*(3), 394–405. https://doi.org/10.1108/ejm-06-2016-0362

[20]. Kwallek, N., Woodson, H., Lewis, C. M., & Sales, C. (1997). Impact of three interior color schemes on worker mood and performance relative to individual environmental sensitivity. *Color Research and Application,* *22*(2), 121–132. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6378(199704)22:2<121::AID-COL7>3.0.CO;2-V

[21]. Lagrosen, S., & Lagrosen, Y. (2020). Workplace stress and health – the connection to quality management. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2020.1807317

[22]. Lee, S. Y., & Brand, J. L. (2005). Effects of control over office workspace on perceptions of the work environment and work outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *25*(3), 323–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.001

[23]. M. Douglas, S. V. Katikireddi, M. Taulbut, M. McKee, and G. McCartney, "Mitigating the wider health effects of COVID-19 pandemic response," *BMJ*, vol. 369, no. April, pp. 1–6, 2020, doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1557.

[24]. McCarthy, C., Lambert, R., & Fitchett, P. G. (2018). Teacher stress and coping. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0145

[25]. Ministry of Education Malaysia, Malaysian Education Development Plan 2013-2025. (2013). Putrajaya; Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. https://www.moe.gov.my/menumedia/media-cetak/penerbitan/dasar/1207-malaysia-education-blueprint-2013-2025/file

[26]. Mustafa, M., Illzam, E. M., Muniandy, R. K., Hashmy, M. I., Sharifa, A. M., & Nang, M. K. (2015). Causes and Prevention of Occupational Stress. *IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences*, *14*(11), 98–104

[27]. Neves de Jesus, S., & Lens, W. (2005). An integrated model for the study of teacher motivation. *Applied Psychology*, *54*(1), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00199.x

[28]. Ni, L. (2020). 'Blended Learning through Google Classroom'. World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, Open Science Index 160, *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences*, 14(4), 215 - 221. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12489845

[29]. Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: How do we optimise health? *BMC Public Health*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09875-z

[30]. Ogunola, A (2020). Impact of Job Stress on Family Integration. *KIU Journal Of Social Sciences, 5*(4), 225-234.Andonova, A. The nutritional habits of female students aged 18 to 25. Trakia Journal of Sciences, 16(1), 235-240.

[31]. Oseland, N., & Hodsman, P. (2018). A psychoacoustical approach to resolving office noise distraction. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, *20*(4), 260–280. https://doi.org/10.1108/jcre-08-2017-0021

[32]. Ouellette, R. R., Frazier, S. L., Shernoff, E. S., Cappella, E., Mehta, T. G., Maríñez-Lora, A., Cua, G., & Atkins, M. S. (2018). Teacher job stress and satisfaction in urban schools: Disentangling individual-, Classroom-, and Organizational-Level Influences. *Behavior Therapy*, *49*(4), 494–508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2017.11.011

[33]. Quick, J. C., Macik-Frey, M., & Nelson, D. L. (2017). Job stress ☆. *Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-809324-5.05616-9

[34]. Relman, E. (2020, January 21). *China confirmed that the deadly Wuhan virus sweeping the country can spread from human to human, increasing the risk of an epidemic*. Insider. https://www.businessinsider.com/deadly-china-wuhan-virus-spreading-human-to-human-officials-confirm-2020-1.

[35]. Rusdi, S. D., Mohd, I. H., Omar, M. K., Aluwi, A. H., Hussein, N., & Masri, M. A. (2020). Job stress and its predictors among Malaysian teachers. *The Journal of Organizational Management Studies*, *2021*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.5171/2021.863862

[36]. Saidin, N., & Husnin, H. (2021). Google Classrrom Sebagai Pelantar M-Pembelajaran: Tahap Pengetahuan Dan Tahap Kesediaan Guru-Guru Sekolah Menengah Luar Bandar. *Jurnal Dunia Pendidikan, 3*(2), 278-292. Retrieved from http://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/jdpd/article/view/14100

[37]. WHO. (2020, February 11). *WHO director-general's remarks at the media briefing on 2019-nCOV on 11 February 2020*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020.

[38]. Yildirim, K., Akalin-Baskaya, A., & Celebi, M. (2007). The effects of window proximity, partition height, and gender on perceptions of open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *27*(2), 154–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.01.004

[39]. Yuliana, Y. (2020). Corona virus diseases (Covid-19); Sebuah tinjauan literatur. *Wellness and Healthy Magazine*, *2*(1), 187–192. https://doi.org/10.30604/well.95212020