

COPING MECHANISM OF GUIMARAS STATE COLLEGE PERSONNEL TOWARDS STRESS

Erwin D. Dumagpi, Julieta G. Infante
& Maha Kamal Eddin L. Baker

ABSTRACT

Coping mechanisms are brought about by a person's conscious minds. This study aimed to determine the coping mechanism of Guimaras State College (GSC) personnel towards stress. Descriptive-correlational research design was used. The respondents were the 96 faculty and staff of GSC, Salvador Campus. The stratified random sampling through ratio and proportion was used to determine the actual number of respondents. Data were collected using the adopted standard WAYS of coping. The data that were gathered was analyzed using descriptive analysis. Majority of the respondents were females, ages ranging from 20 to 43 years old, single and have a permanent status of employment while one third of the respondents were the minimum wage earner. GSC Personnel tolerance toward stress was moderate. As to their coping mechanisms when group according to their demographic profile was likewise moderate. Moreover, there were no significant differences in the self-perceived level of stress and the coping mechanism of the respondents. A positive correlation existed between the stress level and coping mechanism of GSC personnel.

Keywords: Coping mechanisms, stress, GSC, personnel

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Coping mechanisms means to invest one's own conscious effort to solve personal and interpersonal problems. These are ways to which external or internal stress is managed, adopted to, or acted upon, (Sincero, 2013). Coping in the psychological term, may be defined as expending of a conscious effort to solve personal and interpersonal problems and seeking to master, minimize, or tolerate stress or conflict (Wieten, W& Lloyd, M.A., 2008). Stress is a physical, chemical or emotional factor that causes bodily or mental tension and may be a factor in disease causation. Stress produces numerous physical and mental symptoms which vary according to each individual's situational factors (Susic, 2013). A stressor is anything that causes the release of stress hormones. There are two broad categories of stressors, physiological and psychological stressors (humanstress.ca, 2014). The environmental threats and challenges one encounters in his/her daily life situation has most of the time results in negative feelings. Stress can be external and related to the environment, (Jones, Bright & Clow, 2001). When stress becomes excessive, employees manifest various symptoms that can affect their job performance and health and even threaten their ability to cope with the environment.

The principal concern of this study is to find the causes and factors that contributed to the stress level of the Guimaras State College (GSC) personnel and to learn the coping mechanisms that may temporarily or permanently reduce stress. It also aims to find out if there is any significant difference in the level of stress and coping mechanism of GSC Personnel as perceived by faculty and staff. Each individual handles stress differently and every person has a different threshold (Brock & Grady, 2002).

Coping responses are partly controlled by personality, but also partly by the social environment, particularly the nature of the stressful environment (Smith, 2012). Stress is a way of life and is an important step in rising to the challenges of a leadership position. On the other hand, occupational stress can lead to loss of job satisfaction and ultimately looking for other work (Brock & Grady, 2002).

This study identified the most commonly used coping mechanism by the GSC Personnel. Over the course of this study, coping as a process was evaluated and respondents were asked to identify those coping mechanism they used to manage any work-related stressful event they have experienced within the scope of their employment in the institution. Work-related stress is defined by the Occupation Health Safety Organization (2006) as "the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Job stress can lead to poor health and even injury. Once the specific coping mechanism, will be identified, future research into the most successful coping mechanism for managing stress can be conducted.

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to determine the level of stress among the GSC personnel and to arbitrate the different coping mechanism exercised by the personnel. This study aimed to answer the following questions: (1) What is the profile of the respondents when grouped according to their sex, age, civil status, monthly income, employment status and length of service?, (2) What is the level of self-perceived stress of GSC Personnel as a whole and when categorized according to their sex, age, civil status monthly income employment status and length of service?, (3) What are the coping mechanisms of GSC personnel as a whole,(4) What is the coping mechanisms of GSC personnel when categorized into variables of age, sex, civil status, monthly income, employment status and length of service? (5) Are there significant differences in the self-perceived level of stress and coping mechanism of GSC Personnel when grouped into faculty or staff?, and (6) Is there a relationship between the level of self-perceived stress and coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel when grouped into faculty or staff?

METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive research design in order to determine the coping mechanisms of GSC personnel towards stress. Descriptive research design is a type of research that can obtain facts about existing conditions, detect a significant relationship between current phenomena which are helpful in decision making, educational planning in internal evaluation or assessment (Shields, 2013). This also concerned with conditions and relations that exist, practices that prevails, beliefs, point of views or attitude that are being felt. Descriptive research involves the gathering of data in order to test a hypothesis or answer concerning the current status of the subject o the study (Shells & Rangarajan, 2013). It involves the description and recording of conditions that exist (Kelly, 2014).

This study was conducted at GSC Salvador campus, located at Brgy. Mclain, Buenavista for A.Y. 2014-2015. The respondents of the study were the 96 GSC faculty and staff. They were identified through the checklist coming from the Human Resource Management Office and were chosen through simple random sampling technique. To determine the number of respondents the researchers used stratified random sampling through ratio and proportion to allocate representative sample among the personnel. For the 96 respondents, 52 were identified as faculty and 44 were identified as staff.

The coping mechanisms utilized by the GSC Personnel to manage stress was examined using descriptive survey methods. Data were collected using the adopted standard WAYS of Coping Questionnaire (WAYS) developed by Folkman and Lazarus (1988) which was also used by a study conducted by Smith (2012) and De la Cruz et al. (2011).

The WAYS questionnaire is a standardized and commercially available instrument designed to measure coping mechanisms. The questionnaire composed of three parts: the part 1 was the personnel profile which contained demographics/personal information including sex, age, civil status, employment status, monthly income and length of service. Part2 asked respondents to rank their overall level of stress on a Likert-scale from 1 to 10 in alignment with the stress level scale used by the American Psychological Association (2011) for ranking of self-perceived level stress. Part 3 of the questionnaire sought to determine the coping mechanisms respondents use to manage stressful events. This was reported through participant

completion of WAYS questionnaire which included 50 questions to describe to what extent Personnel used a particular way of coping to deal with their potential stressor. The response format for the WAYS of coping section of the questionnaire will be a 4-point Likert scale.

The coping mechanisms which were identified through WAYS questionnaire were described as follows: Confrontive Coping (Scale 1) describes aggressive efforts to alter and suggests some degree of hostility and risk-taking. Distancing (Scale 2) describes cognitive effort to detach oneself and to minimize the significance of the situation. Self-controlling (Scale 3) describes efforts to regulate one's own feeling. Seeking Social Support (Scale 4) describes efforts to seek informational support, tangible support, and emotional support. Accepting Responsibility (Scale 5) acknowledges one's own role in the problem with a concomitant theme of trying to put things right. Escape-Avoidance (Scale 6) describes wishful thinking and behavioral efforts to escape or avoid the problem. Items on this scale contrast with the Distancing Scale which suggests detachment.

Planful problem solving (Scale 7) describes problem focused efforts to alter the situation, coupled with an analytic approach to solving the problem. Positive Reappraisal (Scale 8) describes efforts to create positive meaning by focusing on personal growth. It also has religious dimensions.

The data gathered was analyzed using descriptive analysis. The researchers also collected demographic data from the participants to develop group profiles for the selected respondents. The demographic section included six items: sex, age, civil status, monthly income, employment status and length of service. After administering the research questionnaire to the respondents the data were tallied, checked, processed, analyzed and interpreted using SPSS. The statistical tools used in the study were frequency count, percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, chi-square test and Pearson's r.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The profile of the GSC Personnel was determined. Results showed that 60 or 62.5% of the respondents were between the ages of 20 to 43 years old. With regard to their sex, 54 or 56.25 percent were female while 42 or 43.75% were male. Data collected on the personal lives of the respondents' showed that 55 or 57.29% were married and 40 or 41.67% were single, with only 1 or 1% of the respondents were widowed. Respondents with permanent positions constitute 47 or 48.96%, 31 or 32.29% were contractual and 18 or 18.75% were casual employees. Majority of the respondents earned monthly income below the poverty threshold level. There were 32 (33.3%) who are earning per month of P7, 000.00 and below, while 20 (20.8%) earned monthly income between P7, 000.00 to P15, 000.00. Meanwhile, 21 or 21.88% earned P15, 001.00 to P25, 000.00 and it was good to note that 23 or 23.9% earned above P25, 000.00. As to length of service, 41 or 42.71% of the respondents rendered 0 to 5 years length of service, 32 or 33.34% of them was in service of 6 to 15 years, 11 or 11.45% have rendered 16 to 30 years length of service and 12 or 12.50% have work at GSC for 30 years and above. Data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Profile of the respondents

| Profile of the respondents | f | % |
|----------------------------|----|-------|
| Sex: | | |
| Male | 42 | 43.75 |
| Female | 54 | 56.25 |
| Total | 96 | 100.0 |
| Age: | | |
| 20 to 43 years old | 60 | 62.5 |
| 44 years old and above | 36 | 37.5 |
| Total | 96 | 100.0 |
| Civil Status: | | |
| Single | 40 | 41.67 |
| Married | 55 | 57.29 |
| Widowed | 1 | 1.04 |
| Total | 96 | 100.0 |
| Employment Status: | | |
| Permanent | 47 | 48.96 |
| Casual | 18 | 18.75 |
| Contractual | 31 | 32.29 |
| Total | 96 | 100.0 |
| Monthly Income: | | |
| P7,000 and below | 32 | 33.33 |
| P7001 to 15,000 | 20 | 20.83 |
| P15,001 to 25,000 | 21 | 21.88 |
| P25,001 to 35,000 | 15 | 15.63 |
| P35,001 and above | 8 | 8.33 |
| Total | 96 | 100.0 |
| Length of Service: | | |
| 0 to 5 years | 41 | 42.71 |
| 6 to 10 years | 16 | 16.67 |
| 11 to 15 years | 16 | 16.67 |
| 16 to 30 years | 11 | 11.45 |
| 31 years and above | 12 | 12.5 |
| Total | 96 | 100.0 |

Level of Self-perceived stress of GSC Personnel

The Guimaras State College Personnel were asked to rank their self-perceived level of stress on a scale of 1-10. The self-perceived level of stress of GSC Personnel mean level of stress taken as a whole was determined by the use of mean, the result revealed a mean of 6.29 (SD=1.69) interpreted as moderate.

In terms of sex, results revealed that male and female personnel mean level of stress were 6.07 (SD=1.60) and 6.46 (1.76) respectively, described as moderate. The average mean of both sexes was 6.29 (SD= 1.69) also interpreted as moderate. This means that there is no significant difference in the self-perceived level of stress of both sexes.

As to age, results showed that the mean for 44 years old and above was 7.14 (SD=1.40) described as high while respondents aging 20 to 43 years old has a mean score of 5.78 (SD=1.66) described as moderate. This means that the level of self-perceived level of stress of the respondents aging 44 years old and above was higher compared to those aging 20 to 43 years old. This can be said then that those who are older have more stress as compared to their younger counterparts. This can be attributed to the fact that most of these personnel handling sensitive positions in the organizations are those who have stayed longer at GSC.

As to civil status, the results showed that the self-perceived mean level of stress of single respondents was 6.03 (SD=1.67) interpreted as moderate and for married respondents, the mean was 6.47 (SD=1.71) likewise interpreted as moderate.

Table 2. Level of self-perceived stress as to sex, age, and civil status

| Profile | N | Mean | Sd | Interpretation |
|------------------------|----|------|------|----------------|
| Sex | | | | |
| Male | 42 | 6.07 | 1.60 | Moderate |
| Female | 54 | 6.46 | 1.76 | Moderate |
| Total | 96 | 6.29 | 1.69 | Moderate |
| Age | | | | |
| 20 to 43 years old | 60 | 5.78 | 1.66 | Moderate |
| 44 years old and above | 36 | 7.14 | 1.40 | High |
| Total | 96 | 6.29 | 1.69 | Moderate |
| Civil Status | | | | |
| Single | 40 | 6.03 | 1.67 | Moderate |
| Married | 55 | 6.47 | 1.71 | Moderate |
| Widowed | 1 | 7.00 | 0 | High |
| Total | 96 | 6.29 | 1.69 | Moderate |

Scale: 1.00 – 3.99 (Mild), 4.00 – 6.99 (Moderate), 7.00 – 10.00 (High)

Table 3 presents the level of self-perceived stress as to employment status, monthly income, and length of service. As to employment status, results revealed that the mean score for permanent employees was 6.79 (SD= 1.69) described as moderate, casual employees' was 6.17 (SD= 1.20) and contractual employees we 5.61 (Sd=1.73) both have a qualitative description –moderate. This means that the level of self-perceived stress of the respondents were similar regardless of their status of employment.

As to monthly income, results revealed that the respondents whose monthly income was 25,001 to 35,000 got a mean of 7.47 (SD= 1.41) described as high. However, respondents earning 7,000 and below, 7,001 to 15,000, 15,000.00 to 25,000 and 35,000.00 and above have means scores of 5.88 (Sd=1.70), 5.85 (Sd=1.46), 6.33 (Sd=1.71) and 6.75 (Sd=1.83) respectively which were described as –moderate. This means that the respondents who earned 25,001 to 35,000 have a higher level of self-perceived stress compared to others.

As to the length of service, results revealed that respondents with length of service of 0 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 31 years and above have mean scores 5.61 (Sd=1.55), 6.75 (Sd=1.69), 6.44 (Sd= 1.82)and 6.83 (Sd= 1.19) respectively, all described as –moderate. However, the respondents whose length of service was from 16 to 30 years has a mean score of 7.36 (SD=1.69) described as high. This means that the level of self-perceived stress of the respondents whose length of service was from 16 to 30 years was higher compared to others.

Table 3. Level of self-perceived stress as to Employment Status, monthly income, and length of

| Categories | N | Mean | Sd | Interpretation |
|-------------------|----|------|------|----------------|
| Employment Status | | | | |
| Permanent | 47 | 6.79 | 1.69 | Moderate |
| Casual | 18 | 6.17 | 1.20 | Moderate |
| Contractual | 31 | 5.61 | 1.73 | Moderate |
| Total | 96 | 6.29 | 1.69 | Moderate |
| Monthly Income | | | | |
| 7,000 and below | 32 | 5.88 | 1.70 | Moderate |
| 7,001 to 15,000 | 20 | 5.85 | 1.46 | Moderate |
| 15,001 to 25,000 | 21 | 6.33 | 1.71 | Moderate |
| 25,001 to 35,000 | 15 | 7.47 | 1.41 | High |
| 35,001 and above | 8 | 6.75 | 1.83 | Moderate |
| Total | 96 | 6.29 | 1.69 | Moderate |
| Length of Service | | | | |
| 0 to 5 years | 41 | 5.61 | 1.55 | Moderate |
| 6 to 10 years | 16 | 6.75 | 1.69 | Moderate |
| 11 to 15 years | 16 | 6.44 | 1.82 | Moderate |
| 16 to 30 years | 11 | 7.36 | 1.69 | High |
| above 30 years | 12 | 6.83 | 1.19 | Moderate |
| Total | 96 | 6.29 | 1.69 | Moderate |

Scale: 1.00 – 3.99 (Mild), 4.00 – 6.99 (Moderate), 7.00 – 10.00 (High)

Table 4 presents the coping mechanism of GSC personnel when taken as a whole. Results showed that GSC Personnel were most likely to deal with stress by means of Positive Reappraisal ($M=2.41$, $SD=0.56$) which suggests that the respondents exert efforts to create positive meaning by focusing on personal growth. They were also fairly likely to seek social support ($M=2.25$, $SD=0.51$) which suggests that respondents were likely seek informational support, tangible support and emotional support to deal with stress. The data suggests that the Guimaras State College Personnel were also likely to use planful problem solving ($M=2.21$, $Sd=0.56$) which implies that respondents were likely to use problem focused efforts to alter the situation, coupled with an analytic approach to solving the problem. Results also suggest that Escape-Avoidance is the least used coping mechanism by the respondents ($M=1.34$, $Sd=0.61$). The second coping mechanism that has the lowest mean is the confrontive coping ($M=1.71$, $Sd=0.56$). The third coping mechanism that has the lowest mean is Distancing, ($M=1.75$, $Sd=0.48$) Results suggests that GSC Personnel were less likely to confront stress as well as remove themselves from the stressor.

Table 4. Coping mechanism of GSC personnel as a whole

| Coping Mechanism of GSC Personnel | Mean | Sd | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| A. Confrontive Coping | 1.71 | 0.56 | Moderate |
| B. Distancing | 1.75 | 0.48 | Moderate |
| C. Self-controlling | 1.98 | 1.16 | Moderate |
| D. Seeking Social Support | 2.25 | 0.51 | Moderate |
| E. Accepting Responsibility | 2.08 | 0.62 | Moderate |
| F. Escape-Avoidance | 1.34 | 0.61 | Inadequate |
| G. Planful Problem Solving | 2.21 | 0.56 | Moderate |
| H. Positive Reappraisal | 2.41 | 0.48 | Adequate |
| Total | 1.97 | 0.40 | Moderate |

Scale: 1.00 – 1.66 (Inadequate), 1.67 – 2.33 (Moderate), 2.34 – 3.00 (Adequate)

Table 5 presents the coping mechanism of the respondents in terms of sex, age, and civil status. In terms of sex, results revealed that when GSC Personnel categorized as male and female were determined, the result revealed that both male and female group had moderate level of coping mechanisms. The results show that male respondents have a slightly higher mean than female respondents ($M=2.02$, $Sd=0.37$). While female respondents results showed coping mechanism mean of ($M=1.92$, $Sd= 0.41$) The results imply that both groups are able to deal with stressors and cope effectively.

In terms of age, results revealed that when the coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel categorized as younger (20 to 43 years old) and older (44 years old and above), the result revealed that the younger group has a slightly lower mean coping mechanism ($M= 1.87$, $Sd= 0.34$) described as moderate. The mean coping mechanism of the older category is slightly higher than the younger category ($M=2.13$, $Sd=0.44$) also described as moderate.

In terms of civil status, result revealed that when the coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel categorized as to their civil status; single, married, and widowed, those respondents who were single and married had a moderate level of coping mechanism. The mean coping mechanism of Single respondents was slightly higher ($M=2.00$, $Sd=0.39$). There is only a slight difference with the mean coping mechanism of Married respondents ($M=1.95$, 0.40). The results also show that there is a significant difference in the mean coping mechanism of the sole widowed respondent as compared to the other two categories, ($M=1.50$) described as inadequate.

Table 5.Coping mechanism of GSC Personnel as to sex, age and civil status

| Particulars | Mean | Sd | Interpretation |
|------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Sex | | | |
| Male | 2.02 | 0.37 | Moderate |
| Female | 1.92 | 0.41 | Moderate |
| Total | 1.97 | 0.40 | Moderate |
| Age | | | |
| 20 to 43 years old | 1.87 | 0.34 | Moderate |
| 44 years old and above | 2.13 | 0.44 | Moderate |
| Total | 1.97 | 0.40 | Moderate |
| Civil Status | | | |
| Single | 2.00 | 0.39 | Moderate |
| Married | 1.95 | 0.40 | Moderate |
| Widowed | 1.50 | 0 | Inadequate |
| Total | 1.97 | .40 | Moderate |

Scale: 1.00 – 1.66 (Inadequate), 1.67 – 2.33 (Moderate), 2.34 – 3.00 (Adequate)

Table 6 presents the coping mechanism of the respondents in terms of employment status, monthly income, and length of service. In terms of employment status, results revealed that when the coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel categorized as to Employment Status; permanent, casual, and contractual the results showed that the mean coping mechanism of the permanent respondents ($M=2.02$, $Sd=0.45$) is slightly higher than that of the other two categories but still described as moderate. There is a very little difference in the mean coping mechanism of casual and contractual respondents, ($M=1.94$, $Sd=0.32$) and ($M=1.90$, $Sd=0.32$) both results described as moderate. The result suggests that there is no significant difference in the coping mechanism of GSC Personnel when categorized as to their employment status.

In terms of monthly income, results revealed that when the coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel were categorized as to monthly income, the result showed that there was no significant difference in the coping mechanism of the respondents. Respondents with a monthly income of P7,000.00 and below has the lowest mean coping mechanism ($M=1.90$, $Sd=0.31$) while respondents with a monthly income of P35,000.00 and above have the highest mean coping mechanism ($M=2.57$, $Sd=0.51$). Respondents with a monthly income of P25,001.00 to P35,000.00 has the second highest mean ($M=2.02$, $Sd=0.48$) described as moderate.

In terms of length of service, results revealed that when the coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel were categorized as to the length of service, the results showed no significant difference in the mean coping mechanism of the respondents. Respondents with the length of service of 16 to 30 years and 31 years and above have the highest mean coping mechanism ($M=2.27$, $Sd=0.51$) and ($M=2.01$, $Sd=0.42$) respectively. On the contrary, respondents with the shortest length of service, 0 to 5 years, has the lowest mean coping mechanism ($M=1.89$, $Sd=0.34$).

Table 6. Coping Mechanism of GSC as to Employment Status, monthly income, and length of service

| Particulars | Mean | Sd | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Permanent | 2.02 | 0.45 | Moderate |
| Contractual | 1.90 | 0.32 | Moderate |
| Total | 1.97 | 0.40 | Moderate |
| 7,000 and below Monthly Income | 1.90 | 0.31 | Moderate |
| 7,001 to 15,000 | 1.95 | 0.34 | Moderate |
| 15,001 to 25,000 | 1.93 | 0.43 | Moderate |
| 25,001 to 35,000 | 2.02 | 0.48 | Moderate |
| 35,001 and above | 2.27 | 0.51 | Moderate |
| Total | 1.97 | 0.40 | Moderate |
| Length of Service | | | Moderate |
| 0 to 5 years | 1.89 | 0.34 | Moderate |
| 6 to 10 years | 1.96 | 0.34 | Moderate |
| 11 to 15 years | 1.92 | 0.41 | Moderate |
| 16 to 30 years | 2.27 | 0.51 | Moderate |
| 31 years and above | 2.01 | 0.42 | Moderate |
| Total | 1.97 | 0.40 | Moderate |

Scale: 1.00 – 1.66 (Inadequate), 1.67 – 2.33 (Moderate), 2.34 – 3.00 (Adequate)

Significant differences in the self-perceived level of stress and coping mechanism of GSC Personnel when categorized into faculty and staff

The t-test conducted showed that there was no significant difference in the self-perceived level of stress and the coping mechanism of the respondents when classified classification as to faculty and staff. This meant that their level of self-perceived stress and coping mechanisms towards stress was likely the same which is moderate. The data are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Differences in self-perceived level of stress and the coping mechanism of Guimaras State College Personnel

| Particulars | | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Remarks |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------|--------|-----------------|-------------|
| Stress | Equal variances assumed | .503 | 94 | .616 | Not |
| | Equal variances not assumed | .497 | 86.792 | .620 | significant |
| Coping | Equal variances assumed | .935 | 94 | .352 | Not |
| | Equal variances not assumed | .955 | 93.307 | .342 | significant |

Table 8 presents the relationship between stress level and coping mechanism of the respondents. Results revealed that there is a positive correlation existed between stress level and coping mechanism ($r=.232$, $p\text{-value}= .23$). This means that in general, the stress level of personnel affects coping mechanism wherein the higher the stress level the more the personnel had greatly coped with it applying those indicated mechanisms. This may imply that stress could be manageable when there are proper and effective treatments.

Table 8. Relationship of stress level and coping mechanisms of GSC Personnel

| Particulars | | Stress level | Coping Mechanisms | Interpretation |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | | | .232* | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 96 | .023 | Not Significant |
| | N | | 96 | |
| | Pearson | .232* | 1 | |
| Coping mechanisms | Correlation sig. (2-tailed) | .023 | | Not Significant |
| | N | 96 | 96 | |

* $p < .05$ level of significance

CONCLUSIONS

The coping mechanism of GSC Personnel, when classified according to variables of sex, age, marital status, monthly income, employment status and length of service, shows that they can cope well with the challenges of dealing with stress. When GSC Personnel were faced with a stressor it can be noted that they were most likely to use positive reappraisal as the coping mechanism with positive reappraisal being an adaptive rather than an avoidant strategy. The results showed that GSC personnel can cope well with the challenges of dealing with stress. When GSC Personnel were grouped into faculty and staff results showed that there was no significant difference in their self-perceived level of stress and coping mechanism. The self-perceived level of stress and coping mechanisms of GSC personnel affects coping mechanism wherein the higher the perceived stress level the more the personnel had greatly coped with it applying those indicated mechanisms.

REFERENCES

- Brock, B.L. & Grady, M.L. (2002). *Avoiding burnout: A Principal's Guide to keeping the fire alive*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Department of Health & Human Services (2008). *Exposure to Stress: Occupational Hazards in Hospitals*. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). *Manual for the Ways of Coping Questionnaire: Research Edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Jones, Bright & Clow (2001). *Stress: Myth, Theory and Research*. Pearson education, New York 4 Stressor. Center for Studies on Human Stress, retrieved from (<http://humanstress.ca/stress/what-isstress/stressors/>)
- Sinsero, S.M. (2013). *Stress and Coping Mechanisms*, retrieved from (<https://explorable.com/stress-andcoping-mechanisms>)
- Smith, KL. (2012). *COPING Mechanisms and Level of Occupational Stress among Agriculture Teachers and Other Teaching Populations*. Post Graduate Thesis, Utah State University
- Weiten, W. & Lloyd, M.A. (2008). *Psychology Applied to Modern Life (9th Ed.)* Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Sheilds, P.M. & Rangarjan, N. (2013). *Playbook for Research Method: Integrating Conceptual Framework and Project Management*. ISBNN: 10:1-58107-247-3
- Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
- American Psychological Association (2011). *Stress in America Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2011/final-2011.pdf>
- Susic, Paul (2013). *Stress Management: What Can You Do?*. St. Louis Psychologist and Counseling Information and Referrals. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/35181203/LEVEL_OF_STRESS_MANAGEMENT_AMONG_THE_ABM_STUDENTS_BASIS_FOR_INTERVENTION_SCHEME_A_Research