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ABSTRACT
This study investigated the predictors of quality of life i.e. perceived social support and emotion regulation among the 124 private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos. Descriptive-correlational method was utilized by the researcher in this study. Result of Pearson Product Moment Correlation revealed that social support positively correlates to quality of life; whereas no correlation was observed between emotion regulation and quality of life using Spearman correlation. The level of emotion regulation and quality showed no significant difference when grouped according to age, gender, and number of years in teaching. On the other hand, perceived social support also showed no significant difference when grouped according to demographics except in number of years in teaching; however, post hoc test using Tukey HSD does not reveal any significant difference between pairwise groups. Using multiple regression analysis, a significant regression was found. The regression equation formed is given by $Quality\ of\ Life = 73.618 + 4.028(PSS) + 0.841(ER)$. It indicated that a unit increase in perceived social support increases the quality of life by 4.028 units, assuming that emotion regulation is constant.
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CHAPTER 1

The Problem and Its Background

Introduction

In recent years, teachers who were pursuing a career outside the teaching profession were evident. This scenario was more frequent in the private education sector. During the exit interviews conducted by the human resource officers, the teacher's decision to quit was mostly related to their perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life.

Maintaining a good quality of life for teachers is a challenge due to the stress accompanying their task. Teachers with less than five years of experience were reportedly experiencing psychological and physiological challenges in their chosen career as an educator (Korte & Simonsen, 2018) due to emotional needs, labor, and work required for a teacher are significantly high compared to other professions (Chang, 2009). As a result, the challenges that the teachers face, in addition to the psychological and physiological symptoms they experience, may entice them to pursue a career outside the teaching profession.

Every academic institution envisions providing quality education to its learners and a healthy relationship with their constituents. Ensuring teachers' competence plays an important role in achieving these goals.
Since quality of life is connected in education, its quality is an indicator of what the future will hold for an area. Recent years have seen an upsurge of research investigating the characteristics that predict teachers’ effectiveness and quality of life, in particular, how well they succeed in providing high-quality instruction that fosters student learning.

Although a myriad of studies have shown that teachers’ quality of life is a good indicator for teachers whether to continue or not in the teaching profession, insufficient attention has been paid to the possible factors that may affect the teachers’ quality of life. The implications of the study of Manju & Basavarajappa (2016) on emotion regulation and social support (Yuh & Choi, 2017) deserved to be explored further. It is generally assumed that emotion regulation and social support were positively correlated with quality of life. However, this paper suggests that emotion regulation and social support could be used as predictors of the teachers’ quality of life.

It is evident that the alarming increase in the number of teachers who choose to pursue another career outside the teaching profession is closely associated with their professional quality of life while working in the academe. Moreover, several factors could affect the teachers' professional quality of life.
In this study, the researcher will examine the teachers' level of perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life. The researcher will also investigate if social support and emotion regulation predicts the quality of life of the private basic education teachers.

**Background of the Study**

In the study conducted by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), the shortage of teachers could reach 200,000 by 2025, up from 110,000 in 2018. This shortage is due to several factors e.g. working conditions and lack of support. Sutcher et al. (2019) estimated that there is a shortage of approximately 112,000 teachers since 2016 in the United States in which elementary and secondary teaching is marked by high and increasing rates of annual departures of teachers from schools and teaching altogether. Annual teacher turnover is estimated to be close to 14% at the national level and peaks at 20% for high-need schools (Ingersoll et. al, 2014). In the Philippines, a net loss of 132 teachers every year indicates that more individuals left the profession as compared to the ones entering it (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2018).

Recent years have seen an upsurge of research investigating the characteristics that predict teachers’ effectiveness and quality of life, in particular, how well they succeed in providing high-quality instruction that fosters student learning (Kennedy, Ahn, & Choi, 2008; Zumwalt &
Craig, 2005). Some of these predictors are the perceived social support (Korte & Simonsen, 2018) and emotion regulation (Lee et al., 2016).

Social support has been shown to promote mental health and acts as a buffer against stressful life events (Alsubaie et al., 2019). Several studies were made on the impact of social support on quality of life (Alsubaie et al., 2019) and emotion regulation (Tamminen & Gaudreau, 2018) over the past decade.

Being labeled as one the most stressful professions by the American Institute of Stress, teachers are struggling to maintain a good quality of life, especially in the workplace. Although teaching has been described as a profoundly emotional activity, little is known about the emotional demands faced by teachers or how this impacts their well-being (Kinman et al., 2011). Developing teachers’ well-being is a prerequisite in attaining the goals set by any educational institution. Areas with better education system have been shown to have higher level of educational attainment, and as a consequence, higher income (Boas, 2017).

Emotions figure extremely prominent in our lives that it is hard to imagine not having them, they are generally believed to play a crucial role in shaping an individuals’ behavior. Thus, regulation of emotions in an adaptive manner is considered as a vital aspect for quality of life.
Several studies have attested to the relationship between social support and quality of life (Yang et al., 2009; Zhang et al. 2012; Temam et al., 2019). Although a myriad of studies has already established the relationship between social support and quality of life, very few pieces of research were done to explore the possible predictive factors e.g. social support and emotion regulation.

The researcher has observed that the number of teachers migrating to other professions varies in terms of gender, age, and years in teaching. Teachers with less than 5 years of experience has the highest rate of migration (Korte & Simonsen, 2018). Moreover, these variables were also associated with perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life.

Therefore, the researcher pursued this study which determined the current state of the teachers' perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life. Furthermore, the researcher evaluated if social support and emotion regulation predicted the quality of life of the respondents.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was anchored on the concept of Social Support Theory by Don Drennon-Gala and Francis Cullen and Professional Quality of Life by Beth Hudnall Stamm.
Social support is taken into account as a middle-range theory that focuses on relationships and the interactions within those relationships (Kort-Butler, 2017). The theory is centered on the proposition that instrumental, informational, and emotional support help reduce stress which will lead to a high quality of life and well-being. The importance of social relationships in contributing to health and well-being has been the main focus of research by scientists and practitioners in the field of social, behavioral, medical, and nursing disciplines. Social support is commonly utilized in a broad sense, usually on any process through which social relationships might enhance health and well-being.

Likewise, professional quality of life refers to both positive and negative emotions that an individual comes across in his/her job as a helper (Kim et al., 2015). It is affected by and affects the professional well-being and performance of an individual (El-Shafei et al., 2018). Professional quality of life includes compassion satisfaction (positive emotion) and compassion fatigue (negative emotion). Compassion fatigue is composed of two parts—burnout and secondary traumatic stress. The first part is concerned with emotions, such as anger, exhaustion, depression, and frustration. The second part pertains to the negative emotion caused by fear and work-related trauma (Stamm, 2010). Teachers, being considered as one of the helping professions, often deal with stressful and traumatic events that could affect their quality of life.
Moreover, particular attention will be paid to the emotional side of teaching and the role of emotional regulation. The emotional job demands of teaching emerge from teachers’ interactions with students, parents, and colleagues. These emotional job demands denote the specific requirements of the teaching profession on teachers’ emotional expressions, such as showing positive emotions while suppressing negative ones. Teachers’ emotion regulation reflects their ability to successfully interact with their work environment and influence their emotions in workplace. As a function of the interaction between environmental and personal factors, emotion regulation strategies adopted by teachers may further influence their well-being.

**Figure 1**

*Theoretical Model on the Relationship of Social Support and Emotion Regulation to Teachers Quality of Life*

**Predictor 1**

**Social Support**
- Emotional Support
- Instrumental Support
- Informational Support

**Predictor 2**

**Emotion Regulation**
- Cognitive Reappraisal
- Expressive Suppression

H₀₁

H₀₁

Quality of Life
Conceptual Framework

The researcher aimed to identify the relationship between social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life. Moreover, the researcher will also explore if social support and emotion regulation could serve as a predictor of the respondents’ quality of life.

Figure 2

Paradigm of the Study
Statement of the Problem

This study primarily explored the perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life of the private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos. Moreover, this study also investigated if social support and emotion regulation predict teachers’ quality of life. Specifically, this study aimed to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
   1.1 Age
   1.2 Gender
   1.3 Number of years in teaching

2. What is the profile of the respondents according to:
   2.1 Social Support
      2.1.1 Emotional Support
      2.1.2 Instrumental Support
      2.1.3 Informational Support
   2.2 Emotion Regulation
      2.2.1 Cognitive Reappraisal
      2.2.2 Expressive Suppression
   2.3 Quality of Life
      2.3.1 Compassion Satisfaction
      2.3.2 Compassion Fatigue
3. Is there a significant difference in the respondents’ levels of perceived social support compare when grouped according to:

3.1 Age
3.2 Gender
3.3 Number of years in teaching

4. Is there a significant difference in the respondents’ levels of emotion regulation compare when grouped according to:

4.1 Age
4.2 Gender
4.3 Number of years in teaching

5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents’ levels of quality of life compare when grouped according to:

5.1 Age
5.2 Gender
5.3 Number of years in teaching

6. How did the perceived social support and quality of life of the respondents relate to each other?

7. How did the emotion regulation and quality of life of the respondents relate to each other?

8. Will social support and emotion regulation predict the quality of life of the respondents?
Assumptions

The researcher assumed that the respondents answered truthfully and objectively the questions on the three instruments.

Hypothesis

1. There is no significant difference in the respondents' level of perceived social support when grouped according to age, gender, and the number of years in teaching.

2. There is no significant difference in the respondents' level of emotion regulation when grouped according to age, gender, and the number of years in teaching.

3. There is no significant difference in the respondents' level of quality of life when grouped according to age, gender, and the number of years in teaching.

4. There is no significant relationship between perceived social support and teachers’ quality of life.

5. There is no significant relationship between emotion regulation and the teachers' quality of life.

6. Social support and emotion regulation do not predict the teachers’ quality of life.

Significance of the Study

The results of the study will be beneficial to the following:
1. **Teachers.** As the respondents of the study, the teachers will be able to assess their current state of perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life.

2. **Human Resource Officers.** As the primary person in charge of crafting school policies involving mental health, they can utilize the results in this study in formulating policies or interventions for the well-being of the teachers.

3. **Guidance Counselors.** In coordination with the human resource office, guidance counselors can utilize the results of this study in formulating mental health programs that will help the teachers improve their quality of life.

4. **School Administrators.** Being in charge of approving school policies, the result of this study will help them have a better understanding of the current working quality of life of their teaching personnel.

5. **Future Researchers.** Results of this study can be used by the future researchers as a reference if they will conduct a study similar to this field.

**Scope, Delimitation, and Limitation**

The main objective of this study was to investigate the relationship of social support and emotion regulation to teachers’ quality of life. The study included the teachers’ personal information e.g. age, gender, and the number of years in teaching. This study was limited to the private
COLEGIO DE SANTA RITA DE SAN CARLOS, INC.
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school teachers in the S.Y. 2020-2021 in the Division of San Carlos City, Negros Occidental.

The necessary data was gathered using three standardized tests: Emotion regulation Questionnaire which determined the respondents' level of emotion regulation; Questionnaire on the frequency of and satisfaction with social support (QFSSS) which assessed the frequency of and the degree of satisfaction with perceived social support, and Professional Quality of Life which measured the respondents' quality of life. This study was conducted from December 2020 until February 2021.

Definition of Terms

For uniform understanding, the following are defined conceptually and how they are operationally used in the study.

**Age.** This refers to the age group of the respondents namely 20-30, 31-40, 41-50, and 51-60.

**Cognitive Reappraisal.** This refers to the attempt of the teachers to reinterpret an emotion-eliciting situation in a way that alters its meaning and changes its emotional impact.

**Compassion Fatigue.** This refers to the teachers stress resulting from the traumatized students’ experiences rather than the trauma itself.

**Compassion Satisfaction.** This refers to the teachers’ pleasure and satisfying feeling that comes from teaching.
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**Emotional Support.** This refers to the teachers perceived act of empathy, concern, affection, love, trust, acceptance, intimacy, encouragement, or caring from their partner, family, friends, or community.

**Emotion Regulation.** This refers to how the teachers control, regulate, and manage their emotions. It involves the emotional experience, or what the respondents feel inside.

**Expressive Suppression.** This refers to the attempt of the teachers to hide, inhibit or reduce ongoing emotion-expressive behavior.

**Gender.** It encompasses the biological sex (male and female) and sexual orientation of the respondents e.g. lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, questioning, intersex, asexual, ally, pansexual.

**Informational Support.** This refers to the teachers’ received messages that include knowledge or facts, such as advice or feedback on actions from their partner, family, friends, or community.

**Instrumental Support.** This refers to the teachers’ perceived help or assistance in a tangible and/or physical way from their partner, family, friends, or community.

**Number of years in teaching.** It was divided into different year brackets e.g. 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31, and above respectively.

**Perceived Social Support.** This refers to an teachers’ belief that social support is available and that it provides what they consider necessary.
Quality of Life. This refers to the teachers’ overall well-being while practicing their profession.

Teachers. This refers to the private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos City, Negros Occidental.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature and Studies

This chapter presents the related literature and studies. Several books, journals, and research articles were reviewed and analyzed by the researcher to identify the facts about the study. Furthermore, the research gap that this study addressed is presented in this chapter.

Quality of Life

Professional quality of life is the standard that an individual feels about their work as a helper (Stamm, 2010). Both the positive and negative aspects of doing work influence the professional quality of life of a person. A person who works helping others may respond to individual, community, national, and even international crises. Some of them are health care professionals, social workers, teachers, lawyers, cops, firefighters, clergy, transportation staff, disaster responders, and others. Understanding the positive and negative aspects of helping those that experience trauma and suffering can improve the individual’s ability to help and maintain their balance.

There are two aspects of the professional quality of life, namely Compassion Satisfaction (CS) and Compassion Fatigue (CF) (Stamm, 2010). CS is a positive aspect of doing work as a helper. It is the pleasure that an individual feels by being able to do their work. On the other hand, CF is the negative aspect of working as a helper. It encompasses
burnout and secondary traumatic stress (STS). Hydon et al. (2015) defined STS as “the natural consequent behaviors and emotions resulting from knowing about a traumatizing event experienced by a significant other—the stress results from helping or wanting to help a traumatized or suffering person”. On the other hand, burnout is a condition that develops in people who work with people such as teachers, nurses, and first responders (Smallwood-Butts, 2013). It was found out that professionals who were burned out demonstrate a lack of concern for the people they served and often performed poorly in their tasks. With the increasing number of students needing mental health support, teachers are often exposed to traumatizing events and experiences of the students.

Quality of life is influenced by different social factors including relationships and friends (Alsubaie et al., 2019). In the study of Alcala & Aldovino (2011), the respondents were satisfied with all the factors/elements under the family life and relationships domain. It registered a general weighted mean of 4.29. The respondents indicated the highest satisfaction on the relationship with other members of the household, followed by relationship with children and spouse; and relationship with neighbors as the last. In the Philippines, there are a limited number of studies that explore the teachers’ quality of life. Bagtasos & Espere (2009) made a comparative study on the quality of
Social Support

Social support is one of the most commonly studied constructs in the field of community psychology. The American Psychological Association Dictionary of Psychology defined social support as "assistance or comfort to others, primarily to help an individual cope with biological, psychological, and social stressors. An individual may receive social support from an interpersonal relationship in an individual's social network—family members, friends, neighbors, religious institutions, colleagues, caregivers, or support groups. Social support has long been a core social construct in studying personal relationships. Conceptualizations of social support vary widely among researchers, embracing a wide range of different viewpoints and contexts (Yuh & Choi, 2017). For example, Gottlieb & Bergen (2010) provided the following global definition: "The social resources that persons perceive to be available or that are provided to them by non-professionals in the context of both formal support groups and informal helping associations" (p. 512).

Having a supportive environment within their profession is vital to a teacher's development (Kelly & Antonio, 2016). Korte & Simonsen (2018 found that teachers, like many other professionals, need to feel
supported in their efforts. Regardless of the individual’s profession, high levels of perceived support result in more efficacious feelings, and an increased likelihood the individual will remain committed to his or her career. Unfortunately, education has not adopted the philosophies of the corporate world concerning onboarding practices with new or early-career employees and the allocation of resources toward human capital development. This scenario is particularly evident among the small to medium size private schools in the provinces.

Teaching work is entirely based on relationships, given that teachers engage in continuous interaction with students, families, and colleagues (Fiorilli et al., 2017). Given the significant number of demands of being an educator, overcoming the feeling of exhaustion is a challenge. Having a supportive environment, greatly affect in overcoming teachers’ feeling of exhaustion. As confirmed by Betoret (2006), the feeling of being exhausted or oppressed by the demands of the job is markedly less when a social support network of colleagues, superiors, and relatives is available; while teachers with a strong sense of depersonalization, given how this trait has conventionally been measured in the main studies on the topic, tend to become avoidant in their work context without applying for help.

In the study of Ortega, et al. (2013), they asserted that the importance of social support in people’s lives and well-being is well
established. Furthermore, they have identified 11 types of social support in the Philippine context. In this study, the researcher focused on the three sources of support, namely, emotional, informational, and instrumental.

**Social Support and Quality of Life**

In the study of Temam et al. (2019), the results suggested that the putative effect of social support on burnout and quality of life (Yang et al., 2009) depended on the source or type of social support considered. Moreover, social support from supervisors appeared to be more determinant than social support from coworkers when coping with burnout symptomatology. Furthermore, Alshraifeen et al. (2020) found that social support has a direct correlation with increased quality of life among the respondents.

According to Zhang et al. (2012), social support had a positive influence on the quality of life. They further explained that social support from friends or family were strong predictors of the psychological domain of quality of life, and social support was also significantly positively correlated with quality of life.

In the Philippines, a similar study was conducted by Acebedo (2009) on the relationship between Social Support and Quality Of Life of hemodialysis patients. This study further attested to the result of the
study of Zhang et al. (2012) on the positive impact of social support on quality of life.

**Emotion Regulation**

Emotion regulation is the actions that determine which emotions we choose to allow or contain, at what point we should use them, and how should we experience or express those emotions (Gross & John, 2003). Emotion regulation can be intrinsic/intrapersonal (regulating one's own emotions) or extrinsic/interpersonal (regulating someone else's emotions) (Gross and Jazaieri, 2014). Within the past decade, several pieces of research have indicated that emotions are not only based on cognitive processes but could also exert a powerful influence on motivational processes (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2000; Fried, 2010). Positive emotions can broaden thought-action repertoires (Fredrickson, 2001; Fried, 2010), suggesting that students and teachers who experience more positive emotions may generate more ideas and strategies. Efficient use of emotion regulation strategies could help maintain emotional well-being even when an individual is experiencing negative events (Kashdan et al. 2006; Ochsner and Gross, 2005; Troy et al. 2010).

There are two emotion regulation strategies: cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression (Gross & John, 2003). Cognitive reappraisal leading to an altered interpretation of an emotional situation is an
efficient emotion regulation strategy that is closely linked to personal well-being (van der Veek et al. 2009; Moriya & Takahashi, 2013). In contrast, maladaptive emotion regulation had been linked to several mental disorders, including the onset of depressive symptoms (Ehring et al. 2010; Garnefski and Kraaij, 2002; Joormann and D'Avanzato 2010).

Poor emotion regulation has been linked to numerous negative outcomes (Khuanghlawn, 2012). Research has demonstrated that difficulties in emotion regulation may be predictive of problematic behavior, such as workplace functioning (Feng et al., 2009). In the teaching profession, emotion regulation plays a critical role in regulating the teachers' responses toward stressful events. Being tasked with educating the youth entails great challenges that could impact the teachers' quality of life.

In the Philippines, Moreno-Javier (2009) conducted a study that investigates the relationship of emotion regulation to gender, parenting styles, and academic performance but not on social support and quality of life. Therefore, the researcher in this study further explored the relationship of emotion regulation to teachers’ quality of life.

**Predictors of Quality of Life**

Different dimensions of quality of life mean also different predictors for each dimension. Several literatures on quality of life pointed out the role of various kinds of variables. First is the socio-demographic
characteristic. In the study of Fassio et al. 2012, low income was related to low quality of life indexes. Results concerning age are not so univocal. Some study reported that age is inversely related with physical and psychological quality of life (De Girolamo 2001) but others did not find this relation (Fassio et al. 2012). Gender is usually related to subjective evaluation of physical health and psychological status. Women have higher rates of negative affect and depression and poorer subjective health than men (Prus, 2011).

A second group of predictors of quality of life is the capability of social environment to support individuals. Social support from family, friends, and partner is important to cope with traumatic events like serious illness (Coughlin 2008), to face ordinary life events like motherhood (Dyrdal et al. 2011) and in general to have a good level of quality of life. Also the relation with the environment is important, Sense of Community and Place Attachment (Rollero and De Piccoli 2010) are predictors of well-being.

**Summary**

There were literature (Kort-Butler, 2017; Hydon et al., 2015; Alsubaie et al., 2019; Gottlieb & Bergen, 2010; Gross & John, 2003) and studies (Alcala & Aldovino, 2011; Yuh & Choi, 2017; Fiorilli et al., 2017; Betoret, 2006; Ortega, et al., 2013; Temam et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2012; Acebedo, 2009; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2000;
Fried, 2011; Fredrickson, 2001; Troy et al. 2010; Moriya & Takahashi, 2013; Ehring et al. 2010; Garnefski and Kraaij 2006; Joormann and D'Avanzato 2010; Moreno-Javier, 2009; Khuanghlawn, 2012; Feng et al., 2009; Korte & Simonsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2016; Fernandes & Da Rocha, 2009; Tamminen & Gaudreau, 2018) that were conducted in the US and other western countries.

Most of the studies found a significant relationship between social support and quality of life (Yang et al., 2009; Zhang et al. 2012; Temam et al., 2019; Alshraifeen et al., 2020). In the Philippines, few studies were conducted on social support (Ortega, et al., 2013), teachers’ quality of life (Alcala & Aldovino, 2011), and emotion regulation (Moreno-Javier, 2009). However, there is no existing study in the country that explores the factors (e.g. social support and emotion regulation) that predicts quality of life.
CHAPTER 3

Methods and Procedures

This chapter describes the research method, respondents of the study, the instruments used, data gathering procedure, and statistical tests used in analyzing the data.

Research Design

This study utilized the quantitative method of research. The researcher used the descriptive-correlational design which is appropriate in investigating the relationship of social support and emotion regulation to teachers’ quality of life. It is helpful in measuring the association and relationship among the variables. Descriptive correlational studies describe the variables and the relationships that occur naturally between and among them.

Research Procedure

The study was conducted according to the procedures presented in Figure 3. Before the conduct of the study, the researcher attended the orientation for thesis writing, secured the approval of the thesis adviser, obtained topic approval from the department head, and secured permission from the authors of the different instruments used in gathering the necessary data. For the Professional Quality of Life (ProQOL) questionnaire, the researcher sent an email addressed to the Center of Victims of Torture asking their permission to use the
instrument. The permission was granted immediately upon request. A similar procedure was done for the other instruments—Questionnaire on the frequency of and satisfaction with social support (QFSSS) and Emotion Regulation Questionnaire. These questionnaires were taken from open-accessed journal.

**Figure 3**

*Flow Chart of the Procedure*
Setting of the Study

This study was conducted in the Division of San Carlos City, Negros Occidental. The private school basic education teachers were the target respondents of this study.

In the Division of San Carlos, there are five private schools, namely, Colegio de Sto. Tomas-Recoleto, Inc. (CST-R), Colegio de Santa Rita de San Carlos, Inc. (CSR), Tañon College, Our Lady of Peace Mission School (OLPMS) and Daisy’s ABC School.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were the private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos. Table 1 presents the total population of respondents from different private schools.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Schools</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colegio de Sto. Tomas-Recoleto, Inc.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio de Santa Rita de San Carlos, Inc.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tañon College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Peace Mission School</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy’s ABC School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 124 private school basic education teachers from the five private secondary schools in the Division of San Carlos who were the respondents of this study. The highest number is from Colegio de Sto. Tomas-Recoletos, Inc.

**Sampling Technique**

In this study, the researcher utilized purposive sampling. The respondents were the private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos.

**Instruments**

To gather the necessary data for this study, the following research instruments were used by the researcher.

1. **Demographic Profile Sheet.** This was used to gather personal information from the respondents such as age, gender, and the number of years in teaching.

2. **Professional Quality of Life Scale.** This was used to assess the professional quality of life of the respondents. It is a 30 item self-report measure of the positive and negative aspects of care. The respondents will be asked to rate the statements in the questionnaire according to their perceptions. The response option is on a Likert scale; 5 for Very Often, 4 for Often, 3 for Sometimes, 2 for Rarely, and 1 for Never. In the evaluation made by Heritage et al. (2018), compassion satisfaction and compassion fatigue have a reliability of
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.90 which indicates high reliability. In this study, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.77 for compassion satisfaction, 0.63 for burnout, and 0.79 for secondary traumatic stress. For compassion fatigue, the researcher utilized the local norm established by Neil Jordan M. Uy as cited by Ubo (2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Level of Compassion Fatigue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 and below</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-96</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 and above</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For compassion satisfaction and level of quality of life, the researcher used the local norm below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Level of Compassion Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 and below</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 23 and 41</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and above</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Level of Quality of Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.75 and below</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.76-100.99</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 and above</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Questionnaire on the frequency of and satisfaction with social support (QFSSS). This was used to assess the respondents' frequency
of and the degree of satisfaction with perceived social support received from different sources to three types of support: emotional, informational, and instrumental. García-Martín et al., (2016) show high internal consistency (values of Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .763 to .952). The correlational analysis showed significant positive associations between QFSSS scores and measures of subjective well-being and perceived social support, as well as significant negative associations with measures of loneliness (values of Pearson’s r correlation ranged from .11 to .97). The results confirm the validity of the QFSSS as a versatile tool that is suitable for the multidimensional assessment of social support. In this study, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.79 for emotional source, 0.82 for informational source, and 0.91 for instrumental source. The Cronbach’s Alpha result indicates a good internal consistency of the test. The researcher used the local norm below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Interpretation of Perceived Social Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.79</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.80-2.59</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60-3.39</td>
<td>Quite Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40-4.19</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20-5.00</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Emotion Regulation Questionnaire. Is a 10-item self-report questionnaire designed to measure respondents’ tendency to regulate their emotions in two ways: (1) Cognitive Reappraisal (six items), and (2) Suppression (four items), with subscales, scored as the mean of the items. Responses are scored on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 7 ("strongly agree"). Gross et al. (2003) found test-retest reliability of .69 for both the reappraisal and suppression subscales, and the internal consistency of each subscale was acceptable (reappraisal, \(\alpha = .79\); suppression, \(\alpha = .73\)). In the present study, the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.71 for reappraisal and 0.6 for suppression. For the cognitive reappraisal, expressive suppression, and overall emotion regulation, the researcher used the local norm below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00-2.99</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-4.99</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00-7.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Gathering Techniques

The researcher, after the pre-oral defense, asked permission from the principal of the different private secondary schools to conduct the research and administer the questionnaire to the respondents.
Statistical Treatment of Data

To ensure valid and reliable analysis and interpretation of data, the researcher used the statistical tests below. These tests were done using Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 21 (SPSS 21).

1. **Frequency Distribution and Percentage.** These tools were used to describe the data in terms of the respondents’ demographic profile e.g. age, gender, and the number of years in teaching.

2. **Mean and Standard Deviation.** These statistical treatments were used to determine the level of quality of life, emotion regulation, and perceived social support of the respondents. These also help the researcher in formulating insights into the data in comparison to the population.

3. **Pearson Product-Moment Correlation.** This statistical test was used to measure the level of association between two variables.

4. **Spearman Correlation.** This non-parametric statistical test was used to measure the level of association between two variable who do not met the assumptions for Pearson Product-Moment Correlation.

5. **Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).** This statistical test was used to determine the significant difference between three or more variables e.g. age, gender, and the number of years in teaching.
6. **Multiple Regression Analysis.** This statistical test was used to determine if Perceived Social Support and Emotion Regulation significantly predicts the teachers’ Quality of Life.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation of Data

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the 124 respondents who were all private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos for the school year 2020-2021. This study was conducted in order to identify the predictors of teachers’ quality of life.

1. Respondents’ Demographics

1.1 Age. Table 2 presents the profile of the respondents according to their age. Fifty-four percent (54%) of the respondents belong to the 20-30 years old age group. It was followed by the 31-40 years old age group which comprises 22% of the participants. Lastly, 41-50 age group and 51-60 age group has the same percentage of respondents (12%).

Table 2

Profile of the respondents according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years old</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Gender. Table 3 presents the profile of the respondents according to their gender. Seventy-two percent (72%) of the respondents are female, twenty-three percent (23%) are male respondents and two point four percent (2.4%) for gay and bisexual respectively. These values indicate that there is only a small percentage or four point eight percent (4.8%) of the respondents who belong to the LGBTQ community.

**Table 3**

*Profile of the respondents according to gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Number of years in teaching. Table 4 presents the profile of the respondents according to their number of years in teaching. It can be observed that approximately sixty-eight percent (68%) of the respondents belong to the 1-5 years group. This is followed by the 6-10 years group with sixteen percent (16%), 11-15 years group with five percent (5%), 16-20 years group with two percent (2%), 21-25 years group with four percent (4%), and 31-
and-above years group with five percent (5%). Lastly, there is no respondent that belong to 26-30 years age group.

**Table 4**

*Profile of the respondents according to number of years in teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in teaching</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Profile of the Respondents

2.1 Social Support

2.1.1 Emotional Support. Table 5 shows the profile of the respondents according to emotional support. Results indicated that thirty-seven percent (37%) of the respondents have almost always received emotional support from their partner, family, friends, and community. On the other hand, only six percent (6%) of the respondents received sometimes emotional support. These results are good indications that the respondents’ emotional support from peers, family, partner, and community is quite remarkable given that
ninety-four percent (94%) of the total respondents received quite often to always emotional support.

**Table 5**

*Profile of the respondents according to emotional support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Support</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Often</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 Instrumental Support. Table 6 shows the profile of the respondents according to instrumental support. Thirty-two percent (32%) indicated that they almost always received instrumental support from their family and peers. Moreover, the percentage result indicates that there are few respondents or ten percent (10%) received sometimes instrumental support.

**Table 6**

*Profile of the respondents according to instrumental support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Support</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Often</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.3 Informational Support. Table 7 shows the profile of the respondents according to informational support. Result indicates that thirty-five percent (35%) of the respondents have always received informational support from their family, friends, and community. Less than one percent (1%) of the respondents rarely received informational support. The result is a good indication that the respondents receive this support frequently.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informational Support</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Often</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Emotion Regulation

2.2.1 Cognitive Reappraisal. Table 8 presents the profile of the respondents according to cognitive appraisal. Majority or fifty-four percent (54%) of the respondents indicate a high level cognitive reappraisal. This indicates that majority of the respondents has an excellent emotional experience. Meanwhile, only two percent (2%) of the respondents exhibit
a poor emotional experience which is determined by their low
cognitive appraisal level.

**Table 8**

*Profile of the respondents according to cognitive reappraisal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Appraisal Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 **Expressive Suppression.** Table 9 shows the profile of the respondents according to expressive suppression. Seventy-two percent (72%) of the respondents indicated an average level of expressive suppression. This indicates that majority of the respondents has good emotional expression; they show their emotions in the way they talk, act, or behave accordingly. However, only eleven percent (11%) of the respondents exhibit a low expressive suppression level.

**Table 9**

*Profile of the respondents according to expressive suppression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressive Suppression Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Quality of Life

2.3.1 Compassion Satisfaction. Table 10 presents the profile of the respondents according to their compassion satisfaction. Majority of the respondents or sixty-one percent (61%) indicated that they experience moderate compassion satisfaction. This implies that they moderately feel satisfied in their teaching profession.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compassion Satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Compassion Fatigue. Table 11 presents the profile of the respondents according their compassion fatigue. All of the respondents indicated that they experience compassion fatigue which includes burnout and secondary traumatic stress. This implies that all respondents have moderate feeling of unhappiness, disconnectedness, and insensitivity to their work environment. It also indicates moderate feelings of exhaustion, feelings of being overwhelmed, bogged down;
being “out-of-touch” with the person they wants to be, while having no sustaining beliefs.

**Table 11**

*Profile of the respondents according to compassion fatigue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compassion Fatigue</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Comparison of the Respondents Perceived Social Support According to Respondents’ Demographic**

3.1 **Age.** Table 12 presents the respondents’ level of perceived social support when group according to age. Based from the table, the respondents have almost always received social support from their partner, family, friends, and community regardless of age group. Moreover, the result from the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented in Table 13 supports this observation since the result of the test indicated that there is no significant difference on the frequency of social support received by the respondents when grouped according to age, $F(3,120)= 0.970$, $p=0.409$. This implies that the level of social support received by the respondents does not vary between age groups.
Similarly, in the study of Temam et al. (2019) on burnout symptomatology and social support at work of French teachers, they also found no significant difference on the level of social support when grouped according to the age of the respondents.

**Table 12**

*Respondents’ level of perceived social support when grouped according to age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years old</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13**

*Analysis of Variance on the difference of perceived social support when grouped according to age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>89.026</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.185</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 **Gender.** Table 14 presents the respondents’ level of perceived social support when group according to gender. Based from the table, bisexual respondents have received less frequent social support than those of their male, female, and gay counterparts.
Meanwhile, result of ANOVA as presented in Table 15 revealed that there is no significant difference on the frequency of social support received by the respondents when grouped according to gender, \( F(3,120)= 0.476, p=0.699 \). This implies that the level of social support received by the respondents does not differ between genders.

In contrast to the study of Matud et al. (2003), they concluded that there are gender differences in the structure of perceived social support and that these differences can be explained by socialization experiences and social roles associated with gender. However, in the study of Larsin (2011), she found little evidence for gender differences in costs or effectiveness of support use, and emphasized gender differences in support seeking based on perceived availability.

**Table 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>Quite often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Analysis of Variance on the difference of perceived social support when grouped according to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>90.113</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.185</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Number of years in teaching. Table 16 presents the perceived social support received by the respondents when grouped according to the number of years in teaching. It is indicated that respondents teaching for 11 to 15 years and above 31 years have always received social support.

Meanwhile, results of the ANOVA as presented in Table 17 revealed that there is a difference on the frequency of social support received by the respondents when grouped according to number of years in teaching, $F(5,118)=2.546$, $p=0.032$. However, post hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD as presented in Table 18 does not reveal any significant difference between pairwise groups. Furthermore, results of the Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance as presented in Table 19 indicate that the two variables have equal variances, $F(5,118)=1.476$, $p=0.203$. 
Contrary to the study of Ferguson et al. (2017), they asserted that years of experience do not have an impact on the frequency of utilization of social supports.

**Table 16**

*Respondents’ level of perceived social support according to number of years in teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17**

*Analysis of Variance on the difference of perceived social support when grouped according to number of years in teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.881</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>2.546</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>82.305</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.185</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18

**Post Hoc Test using Tukey HSD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Years in Teaching</th>
<th>(J) Years in Teaching</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>-.46190</td>
<td>.20779</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>-1.0639</td>
<td>.1401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>.07143</td>
<td>.49072</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.3502</td>
<td>1.4931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>-.76190</td>
<td>.35292</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-1.7844</td>
<td>.2605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>.67333</td>
<td>.51708</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>-.9647</td>
<td>2.0314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>.60000</td>
<td>.41758</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>-.6098</td>
<td>1.8098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>-.30000</td>
<td>.38875</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>-1.4262</td>
<td>.8262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>.76190</td>
<td>.35292</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-1.2605</td>
<td>1.7844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>.53333</td>
<td>.51708</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>-.9647</td>
<td>2.0314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>.60000</td>
<td>.41758</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>-.6098</td>
<td>1.8098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>-.30000</td>
<td>.38875</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>-1.4262</td>
<td>.8262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>-.07143</td>
<td>.49072</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.4931</td>
<td>1.3502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>-.53333</td>
<td>.51708</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>-2.0314</td>
<td>.9647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>-.66667</td>
<td>.60992</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.7003</td>
<td>1.8337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>-.83333</td>
<td>.59055</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>-2.5442</td>
<td>.8775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>-.13810</td>
<td>.38445</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-1.2519</td>
<td>.9757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>-.90000</td>
<td>.50572</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>-2.3651</td>
<td>.5651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>-.06667</td>
<td>.60992</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.8337</td>
<td>1.7003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>-.90000</td>
<td>.50572</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>-2.3651</td>
<td>.5651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>.76190</td>
<td>.35292</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-1.2605</td>
<td>1.7844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>.83333</td>
<td>.59055</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>-.8775</td>
<td>2.5442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>.90000</td>
<td>.50572</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>-.5651</td>
<td>2.3651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19

**Test for Homogeneity of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Comparison of the Respondents’ Level of Emotion Regulation According to Respondents’ Demographic**
4.1 Age. Table 20 presents the respondents’ level of emotion regulation when grouped according to age. Based from the table, the respondents have average level of emotion regulation regardless of age group. Moreover, the result from the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented in Table 21 supports this observation since the result of the test indicated that there is no significant difference on the level of emotion regulation when grouped according to age, $F(3,120)= 1.922, p=0.130$. This implies that the level of emotion regulation of the respondents does not vary between age groups. It indicates that age has no bearing on the emotion regulation of the respondents. A person’s increase in age does not guarantee an improvement on the person’s level of emotion regulation.

Similarly, in the study of Livingstone et al. (2019) on age similarities and differences in spontaneous use of emotion regulation tactics across five laboratory tasks revealed that results cast some doubt on the assumption that spontaneous emotion regulation is more likely in older age. Furthermore, Gurera & Isaacowitz (2019) assert that the evidence they have gathered in their systematic review of literature does not point to general improvements in emotion regulation with age. This review further supports the result of this study.
Table 20

Respondents’ level of emotion regulation according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years old</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

Analysis of Variance on the difference of emotion regulation when grouped according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>1.922</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58.535</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.347</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Gender. Table 22 presents the respondents’ level of emotion regulation when grouped according to gender. Based from the table, gay respondents have high emotion regulation while male, female, and bisexual respondents exhibit average emotion regulation. Meanwhile, result of ANOVA as presented in Table 23 revealed that there is no significant difference on the respondents’ level of emotion regulation when grouped according to gender, $F(3,120)= 1.672, p=0.177$. This implies that
the level of emotion regulation of the respondents does not differ across genders.

Similarly, Goubet & Chrysikou (2019) found that there is no significant difference on the positive or negative emotion regulation among genders. They further argued that any differences among genders are not likely attributed to a priori differences in current mood or differential effects of the task on current mood between the two groups.

Table 22

Respondents’ level of emotion regulation according to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

Analysis of Variance on the difference of emotion regulation when grouped according to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58.886</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.347</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Number of years in teaching. Table 24 presents the level of emotion regulation of the respondents when grouped according to the number of years in teaching. Results show that the respondents have an average emotion regulation regardless of the number of years they have been teaching. Moreover, results of the ANOVA as presented in Table 25 revealed that there is no significant difference on the level of emotion of the respondents when grouped according to their number of years in teaching, \( F(5,118)=1.458, p=0.209 \). This implies that the number of years in teaching does not affect their emotion regulation. These result signals that the respondents’ years in teaching do not have a bearing on their emotion regulation. Their tenure in their respective schools does not weaken nor strengthen their emotion regulation.

**Table 24**

*Respondents’ level of emotion regulation according to number of years in teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Analysis of Variance on the difference of emotion regulation when grouped according to number of years in teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.569</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57.777</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.347</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Comparison of the Respondents’ Quality of Life According to Respondents’ Demographic**

5.1 **Age.** Table 26 presents the respondents’ quality of life when grouped according to age. The results show that the respondents have a moderate quality of life regardless of age. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented in Table 27 revealed that there is no significant difference on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to age, $F(3,120)=0.821, p=0.485$. This suggests that the quality of life is not affected by the respondents’ age. Similarly, in the concise manual of professional quality of life by Stamm (2010), no statistical differences were observed among the age group of her respondents. This finding indicates that the respondents age has no bearing on their quality of life.
Table 26

Respondents’ quality of life when grouped according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years old</td>
<td>91.93</td>
<td>11.361</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>95.74</td>
<td>12.569</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>93.73</td>
<td>13.101</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>12.722</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

Analysis of Variance on the difference of quality of life when grouped according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62.681</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.968</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Gender. Table 28 presents the respondents’ quality of life when grouped according to gender. The results show that gay respondents have low quality of life while their male, female, and bisexual counterparts have moderate quality of life. Moreover, results of the ANOVA as presented in table 29 revealed that there is no significant difference on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to gender, $F(3,120)=0.607$, $p=0.612$. This suggests that the quality of life
does not vary among genders. Similarly, Stamm (2010) asserts that no statistical differences were observed across genders.

**Table 28**

*Respondents’ quality of life when grouped according to gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93.52</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92.66</td>
<td>11.027</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>17.349</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td>8.021</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 29**

*Analysis of Variance on the difference of quality of life when grouped according to gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63.012</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.968</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 **Number of years in teaching.** Table 30 presents the respondents’ quality of life when grouped according to number of years in teaching. The results show that the respondents have a moderate quality of life regardless of number of years in teaching. Also, analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented in Table 31 revealed that there is no significant difference on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to the
number of years in teaching, $F(5,118)=0.353$, $p=0.880$. This implies that the quality of life is not affected by the number of years in teaching. Furthermore, this result was similar to the findings of Stamm (2010) in which no statistical differences were observed on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to their number of years in their fields.

**Table 30**

*Respondents’ quality of life when grouped according to number of years in teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>11.104</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>93.15</td>
<td>13.635</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td>19.916</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>92.67</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>93.20</td>
<td>12.112</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and above</td>
<td>84.50</td>
<td>14.843</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 31**

*Analysis of Variance on the difference of quality of life when grouped according to number of years in teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63.026</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.968</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Relationship of the Respondents Perceived Social Support to their Quality of Life**

The correlation analysis as presented in Table 32 revealed that there is a significant correlation between these two variables, $r=0.227$, $p=0.011$. Based from the scatter plot as shown in figure 4, there is a positive correlation between perceived social support and quality of life. Although the correlation is weak in nature, it is still positive. This implies that as perceived social support increases, the quality of life also increases but to a weak extent only.

This finding was similar to the result of Zhang et al. (2012) wherein they found that social support has a positive influence on the quality of life. They further explained that social support from friends or family were strong predictors of the psychological domain of quality of life, and social support was also significantly positively correlated with quality of life.

| Table 32 |

**Relationship between perceived social support and quality of life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Social Support Frequency</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Relationship of the Respondents’ Emotion Regulation to their Quality of Life

The scatterplot as presented in Figure 5 shows that there is no linear relationship between emotion regulation and quality of life. It indicates that the variables do not met the assumption of homoscedasticity for Pearson’s r; thus, the researcher utilized the Spearman’s test of correlation. The result of correlation analysis presented in Table 33 shows that there is no significant relationship between emotion regulation and quality of life, $r_s=0.065$, $p=0.47$.

Contrary to the result of Manju & Basavarajappa (2016), results revealed a significant correlation between the variables. However,
reappraisal showed a positive relationship with quality of life while suppression showed a negative relationship.

**Table 33**

*Relationship between emotion regulation and quality of life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion Regulation</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5**

*Scatter plot between emotion regulation and quality of life*

8. **Predictors of Quality of Life**

A multiple linear regression was used to predict quality of life based on perceived social support and emotion regulation. Results of Table 34 indicated that a significant regression was found,
F(2,121)=3.451, p= .035, with an $R^2=0.054$. The regression equation formed is given by $Quality\ of\ Life=73.618+4.028(PSSF)+0.841(ER)$. A unit increase in perceived social support frequency increases the quality of life by 4.028 units, assuming emotion regulation is constant.

Furthermore, this result was supported by the findings of Masthoff et al. (2007) where they assert that external resources, stressor, and especially social support affected the quality of life of the respondents.

**Table 3-4**

*Regression Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>73.618</td>
<td>9.160</td>
<td>8.037</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Regulation</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Teachers’ Quality of Life Enhancement Program (TQOLEP)**

**A. Rationale**

The Proposed Teachers’ Quality of Life Enhancement Program ensures that educators continue to strengthen their leadership, knowledge, and skills using research-based instructional strategies and collaborative practices throughout their career. Policymakers,
Administrators have a responsibility to ensure that educators within their school engage in continuous professional learning and apply that learning to increase student achievement and educators professional being (Hirsh, 2010).

Educators are assigned to professional learning groups based on the priority area of growth. They will be working with other educators receiving the same professional development to encourage social support, collaborative learning and nourished positive climate and increases engagement and target growths to their needs. Being labeled as one the most stressful profession by the American Institute of Stress, having a supportive environment within their profession is vital to a teacher's development (Kelly & Antonio, 2016).

This mission will be accomplished by providing the educators with professional development learning experiences including i.e. workshops and training events, team meetings, collaborative learning and discussion groups, consultations, and mentoring.

B. Goal

The goal of the TQOLEP is to integrate to their development the different aspect of their being, as well as their “quality of life.” This includes providing them with tools to promote, maintain and enhance their quality of life so they can maximize their potential.
C. Objectives

1. Partner with key stakeholders (i.e., HR, Guidance Office, Administration) to integrate development into the each school’s culture and establish development as a priority.

2. Promote important aspects like employee engagement, foster positive and supportive community, boost educators morale, improve quality of life, retention and growth.

3. Identify, develop, and enhance best practices, policies, resources, and programming.

4. Evaluation methods and outcomes on continuing education and professional development opportunities.

D. Framework

Figure 6

*Proposed Teachers’ Quality of Life Enhancement Program Framework*
1. Work-Environment Development. The Work-Environment Development program is intended to nourish good working environment which is one of the most important elements in making the educators feel good and accepted and form them to function and develop. Educators will have a responsibility to participate in the efforts to develop and continuously improve the working environment.

2. Well-Being Development. The Well-Being Development offers a series of workshops and trainings to enhance our understanding of the expected, and unexpected, practices that can contribute to a healthy mind, body, and community. Enrich the wellness component of culture and environment that supports the wellness for educators.

E. Program Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. WORK-ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. GAD Gender Awareness Development</td>
<td>To create awareness about varied gender orientation and to develop gender sensitive work environment.</td>
<td>GAD Orientation, Gender Sensitivity Training, Symposium</td>
<td>Year-Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work-Place Orientation</td>
<td>To learn how to</td>
<td>Training/Workshop</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Peer Support Development</td>
<td>To provide an avenue for educators to foster relationship that will develop support system.</td>
<td>Team Building Peer Mentoring</td>
<td>Before the start of class End of the school year</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mindfulness</td>
<td>To create awareness on the importance of being fully present in one's current state.</td>
<td>Meditation Journal Writing Group Meditation Session</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Journal Mindfulness Assessment Tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. School Identity Formation | To provide activities that will allow the educators to imbibe the culture of the school as a work-environment | Training/Workshop | July | Memorandum Evaluation |

| 4. Constructive Feedback | To develop openness for accepting corrections, as a means for improving oneself. | Mentoring Values Formation Workshop Performance Appraisal | Quarterly | PA Report Attendance |

**B. WELL-BEING DEVELOPMENT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Resiliency</th>
<th>To develop activities that will help educators adapt to vicarious experiences and compassion fatigue.</th>
<th>Training/Workshop</th>
<th>As need arises</th>
<th>Attendance Evaluation Assessment Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To develop mindfulness.
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CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

This chapter presents the summary of findings, the conclusion based on the analysis of data, and recommendations based on the significant results of this study.

This study investigated the perceived social support, emotion regulation, and quality of life of the private school basic education teachers in the Division of San Carlos, Negros Occidental. In this study, the researcher also examined if social support and emotion regulation predict the teachers’ quality of life. It also described the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, and number of years in teaching. Moreover, this study sought to develop a program that will help the private school basic education teachers improve their quality of life.

Summary of Findings

This section provides the summary that captures the highlights of the study according to the research problems. The following are the significant findings based on the analyzed data of the study.

1. Respondents’ Demographics

More than half of the respondents belong to the 20 – 30-year-old age group. Moreover, seventy-two percent (72%) of the respondents are
female. Majority or sixty-eight percent (68%) of the respondents have been teaching for one to five years.

2. Profile of the Respondents

2.1 Social Support

Results indicated that majority or thirty-seven percent (37%) of the respondents have almost always received emotional support from their partner, family, friends, and community. Moreover, thirty-two percent (32%) of them indicated that they almost always received instrumental support from their family and peers. Lastly, 35% of them have always received informational support from their family, friends, and community.

2.2 Emotion Regulation

In terms of cognitive appraisal, majority or fifty-four percent (54%) of the respondents indicate a high level of emotion regulation in this aspect. On the other hand, most of the respondents or seventy-two (72%) indicated an average level of expressive suppression.

2.3 Quality of Life

Sixty one percent of the respondents (61%) indicated that they experience moderate compassion satisfaction. Moreover, all of them indicated that they experience compassion fatigue which include burnout and secondary traumatic stress.
3. Comparison of the Respondents’ Perceived Social Support According to Respondents’ Demographic

3.1 Age. The respondents have almost always received social support from their partner, family, friends, and community regardless of age group. There is no significant difference on the frequency of social support received by the respondents when grouped according to age.

3.2 Gender. Bisexual respondents have received less frequent social support than those of their male, female, and gay counterparts. There is no significant difference on the frequency of social support received by the respondents when grouped according to gender.

3.3 Number of years in teaching. It is indicated that respondents teaching for 11 to 15 years and above 31 years have always received social support. There is a difference on the frequency of social support received by the respondents when grouped according to number of years in teaching. However, post hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD does not reveal any significant difference between pairwise groups.

4. Comparison of the Respondents’ Level of Emotion Regulation According to Respondents’ Demographic
4.1 Age. The respondents have average level of emotion regulation regardless of age group. There is no significant difference on the level of emotion regulation when grouped according to age.

4.2 Gender. Gay respondents have high emotion regulation while male, female, and bisexual respondents exhibit average emotion regulation. There is no significant difference on the respondents’ level of emotion regulation when grouped according to gender.

4.3 Number of years in teaching. The respondents have an average emotion regulation regardless of the number of years they have been teaching. There is no significant difference on the level of emotion of the respondents when grouped according to their number of years in teaching.

5. Comparison of the Respondents’ Quality of Life According to Respondents’ Demographic

5.1 Age. The respondents have a moderate quality of life regardless of age. There is no significant difference on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to age.

5.2 Gender. Gay respondents have low quality of life while their male, female, and bisexual counterparts have moderate quality of life. There is no significant difference on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to gender.
5.3 Number of years in teaching. The respondents have a moderate quality of life regardless of number of years in teaching. There is no significant difference on the quality of life of the respondents when grouped according to the number of years in teaching.

6. Relationship of the Respondents Perceived Social Support to their Quality of Life

There is a significant correlation between perceived social support and quality of life. This implies that as perceived social support increases, the quality of life also increases but to a weak extent only.

7. Relationship of the Respondents’ Emotion Regulation to their Quality of Life

There is no linear relationship between emotion regulation and quality of life. This observation is supported by the result of the correlation analysis that there is no significant relationship between emotion regulation and quality of life.

8. Predictors of Quality of Life

Results indicated that a significant regression was found. The regression equation formed is given by $Quality\ of\ Life = 73.618 + 4.027(PSSF) + 0.841(ER)$. A unit increase in perceived social support frequency, increases the quality of life by 4.028 units, assuming emotion regulation is constant.
Conclusions

The present study explored the predictors of the private school basic education teachers’ quality of life i.e. perceived social support and emotion regulation. The results revealed that perceived social support contributes to the teachers’ quality of life but a weak extent only. On the other hand, emotion regulation result does not correlate with the teachers level of quality of life. This indicates that emotion regulation does not have a bearing on their quality of life.

In terms of teachers’ psychological tests results, it was revealed that bisexual respondents have less frequent social support compared to the male, female, and gay teachers. For quality of life, gay teachers tend to have low level compared to other respondents. These results signal the need for school administrators to formulate more gender inclusive programs.

Recommendations

Considering the result of this study, the researcher formulated the following recommendations:

1. The private school basic education teachers may utilize the result to assess their current level of quality of life.

2. The results of this study may be utilized by the human resource office in formulating appropriate programs and activities that will help in augmenting the level of teachers’ quality of life.
3. It may also be used by the school administrators in formulating institutional policy or faculty development program that will provide an avenue for the development of the private school basic education teachers’ quality of life.

4. Future researchers may replicate this study with a wider respondents, not only limited to the private schools. It is also encouraged that future researchers would conduct an in-depth study on the specific constructs of social support and their impact on quality of life. Furthermore, a qualitative approach of research is also recommended to have an in-depth understanding of the results.
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Permission to Use ProQOL

Thank you for your interest in the ProQOL.

The ProQOL measure may be freely copied and used, without individualized permission from the ProQOL office, as long as:
(a) You credit The Center for Victims of Torture and provide a link to www.ProQOL.org;
(b) It is not sold; and
(c) No changes are made, other than creating or using a translation, and/or replacing "[helper]" with a more specific term such as "nurse."

Because you have agreed that your use of the ProQOL follows the above criteria, the ProQOL Office at the Center for Victims of Torture grants you permission to use the ProQOL. Your recorded request is attached here as a PDF.

If you have any questions or comments, you can contact us at proqol@cvt.org. Note that unfortunately our capacity is quite limited, as this is a volunteer-run effort, but we will do what we can to respond within a couple of weeks.

Thank you!

The ProQOL Office
The Center for Victims of Torture
proqol@cvt.org

PermissionToUseProQOL.pdf
18K
Request for copy and permission to use Questionnaire on the Frequency of and Satisfaction with Social Support (QFSSS)

Dear Dr. Miguel Ángel García-Martín,

Good day

I am currently conducting a study on the mediating role of emotion regulation on the relationship between social support and teacher burnout. In line with this, I would humbly ask for a copy of QFSSS. Your positive response regarding this matter will greatly contribute to the success of this study. Moreover, please be assured that I cite your work properly and include your name in the acknowledgement part of my paper.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Danilo A. Robico Jr.
MA Guidance and Counseling, Philippines
Permission to Use the ProQOL

Thank you for your interest in using the Professional Quality of Life Measure (ProQOL). Please share the following information with us to obtain permission to use the measure:

Please provide your contact information:

Email Address
danilo.roblicojr.cstr@gmail.com

Name
Danilo A. Roblico Jr.

Organization Name, if applicable
Colegio de Sto. Tomas-Recoletos, Inc.

Country
Philippines

Please tell us briefly about your project:

A research on burn out and mental health of teachers during covid-19

What is the population you will be using the ProQOL with?

Secondary school teachers

In what language/s do you plan to use the ProQOL?

Listed here are the languages in which the ProQOL is currently available (see https://proqol.org/ProQol_Test.html). If you wish to use a language not listed here, please select “Other” and specify which language/s.

English

The ProQOL measure may be freely copied and used, without individualized permission from the ProQOL office, as long as:

- You credit The Center for Victims of Torture and provide a link to www.ProQOL.org;
- It is not sold; and
- No changes are made, other than creating or using a translation, and/or replacing "[helper]" with a more specific term such as "nurse."

Note that the following situations are acceptable:

- You can reformat the ProQOL, including putting it in a virtual format
- You can use the ProQOL as part of work you are paid to do, such as at a training: you just cannot sell the measure itself

Does your use of the ProQOL abide by the three criteria listed above? (If yes, you are free to use the ProQOL immediately upon submitting this form. If not, the ProQOL office will be in contact in order to establish your permission to use the measure.)

Yes
Thank you for your interest in the ProQOL! We hope that you find it useful. You will receive an email from the ProQOL office that records your answers to these questions and provides your permission to use the ProQOL.

We invite any comments from you about the ProQOL and the experience of using it at proqol@cvt.org. Please also contact us if you have any questions about using the ProQOL, even if you noted them on this form. Note that unfortunately, our capacity is quite limited so we may not be able to respond to your note: however, we greatly appreciate your engagement.
Dear Respondent,

Good day!

The undersigned researcher is currently conducting a research entitled “Perceived Social Support and Emotion Regulation as Predictors of the Quality of Life by the Private School Teachers in San Carlos Division” as a requirement in the degree Master of Arts in Education major in Guidance and Counseling. Your active participation in answering the attached questionnaire will greatly contribute to the success of this study.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Danilo A. Roblico Jr., LPT

I. Demographics
   Direction: Check the box of your response.

   Name (optional): __________________________

   Gender:  □ Male  □ Bisexual  □ Questioning  □ Pansexual
            □ Female □ Transgender □ Intersex
            □ Lesbian □ Transsexual □ Asexual
            □ Gay    □ Queer     □ Ally

   Age:  □ 20-30 years old  □ 31-40 years old
          □ 41-50 years old  □ 51-60 years old

   Institution: □ Colegio de Sta. Rita de San Carlos, Inc.
                  □ Colegio de Sto. Tomas-Recoletos, Inc.
                  □ Tañon College
                  □ Our Lady of Peace Mission School
                  □ Daisy’s ABC School

   Number of teaching years:  □ 1-5    □ 11-15    □ 21-25    □ 31 and above
                               □ 6-10    □ 16-20    □ 26-30
II. Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Gross & John, 2003)

The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire is designed to assess individual differences in the habitual use of two emotion regulation strategies: cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression.

**Instructions and Items**

The researcher would like to ask you some questions about your emotional life, in particular, how you control (that is, regulate and manage) your emotions. The questions below involve two distinct aspects of your emotional life. One is your emotional experience, or what you feel like inside. The other is your emotional expression, or how you show your emotions in the way you talk, gesture, or behave. Although some of the following questions may seem similar to one another, they differ in important ways. For each item, please answer using the following scale:

1-----------------2--------------------3-------------------4------------------5---------------6-------------7

Strongly disagree neutral strongly agree

___1. When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change what I’m thinking about.

___2. I keep my emotions to myself.

___3. When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I change what I’m thinking about.

___4. When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them.

___5. When I’m faced with a stressful situation, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me stay calm.

___6. I control my emotions by not expressing them.

___7. When I want to feel more positive emotion, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.

___8. I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I’m in.

___9. When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them.

___10. When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.

Reference:

III. **Questionnaire on the frequency of and satisfaction with social support (QFSSS).**

The Questionnaire on the Frequency of and Satisfaction with Social Support (QFSSS) was designed to assess the frequency of and the degree of satisfaction with perceived social support received from different sources in relation to three types of support: emotional, informational, and instrumental. Encircle the number of your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOTIONAL SUPPORT:</strong> your partner is loving, affectionate and listens to you when you want to talk and express your feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT:</strong> Would you do a favor if needed or is willing to do specific things for you, such as providing money, taking you to the doctor or helping you in any other activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATIONAL SUPPORT:</strong> Gives you useful advice and information regarding questions, problems or daily tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY</strong></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOTIONAL SUPPORT:</strong> They are loving and affectionate and listen to you when you want to talk and express your feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT:</strong> Would you do a favor if needed or are willing to do specific things for you, such as providing money, taking you to the doctor or helping you in any other activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATIONAL SUPPORT:</strong> Give you useful advice and information regarding questions, problems or daily tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIENDS</strong></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOTIONAL SUPPORT:</strong> They are loving and affectionate and listen to you when you want to talk and express your feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT:</strong> Would you do a favor if needed or are willing to do specific things for you, such as providing money, taking you to the doctor or helping you in any other activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INFORMATIONAL SUPPORT:** Give you useful advice and information regarding questions, problems or daily task.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY** (support from neighbors, the parish, associations and clubs, and the community in general)

**EMOTIONAL SUPPORT:** they are loving and affectionate and listen to you when you want to talk and express your feelings.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT:** Would do you a favor if needed or are willing to do specific things for you such as providing money, taking you to the doctor or helping you in any other activity.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATIONAL SUPPORT:** Give you useful advice and information regarding questions, problems or daily tasks.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference:  
Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL)

Compassion Satisfaction and Compassion Fatigue
(ProQOL) Version 5 (2009)

When you [help] people you have direct contact with their lives. As you may have found, your compassion for those you [help] can affect you in positive and negative ways. Below are some questions about your experiences, both positive and negative, as a [helper]. Consider each of the following questions about you and your current work situation. Select the number that honestly reflects how frequently you experienced these things in the last 30 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1=Never</th>
<th>2=Rarely</th>
<th>3=Sometimes</th>
<th>4=Often</th>
<th>5=Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am preoccupied with more than one person I [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I get satisfaction from being able to [help] people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel connected to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I jump or am startled by unexpected sounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel invigorated after working with those I [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I find it difficult to separate my personal life from my life as a [helper].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am not as productive at work because I am losing sleep over traumatic experiences of a person I [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I think that I might have been affected by the traumatic stress of those I [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel trapped by my job as a [helper].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Because of my [helping], I have felt &quot;on edge&quot; about various things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I like my work as a [helper].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I feel depressed because of the traumatic experiences of the people I [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel as though I am experiencing the trauma of someone I have [helped].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I have beliefs that sustain me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am pleased with how I am able to keep up with [helping] techniques and protocols.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am the person I always wanted to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My work makes me feel satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel worn out because of my work as a [helper].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I have happy thoughts and feelings about those I [help] and how I could help them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I feel overwhelmed because my case [work] load seems endless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I believe I can make a difference through my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I avoid certain activities or situations because they remind me of frightening experiences of the people I [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am proud of what I can do to [help].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>As a result of my [helping], I have intrusive, frightening thoughts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I feel &quot;bogged down&quot; by the system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have thoughts that I am a &quot;success&quot; as a [helper].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I can't recall important parts of my work with trauma victims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am a very caring person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am happy that I chose to do this work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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