



The Nexus Between Administrative Indifference and Teacher Stress In Managing Chronic Disruptive Student Behaviour: A Quantitative Analysis

¹Javeria Gul -Email- javeriagull929@gmail.com

²Dr. Muhammad Arshad Dahar -Email- drarshad1969@uaar.edu.pk

³Ms. Shahida Yousaf

¹M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi

²Assistant Professor, Ph.D. Education, Department of Education, Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi

³Lecturer, M.Phil. Education, Department of Education, Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi

Article Details:

Received on 15 May 2025

Accepted on 24 June 2025

Published on 28 June 2025

Corresponding Author*:

drarshad1969@uaar.edu.pk

Abstract

This quantitative study explores the nexus between administrative indifference and teacher stress in managing chronic disruptive student behaviour in secondary public schools. Students' chronic misbehavior poses ongoing difficulties that have a significant effect on classroom management and teacher well-being. The purpose of the study is to examine how teachers who are responsible for handling such behavioral difficulties experience elevated stress levels as a result of administrative oversight and a lack of support. A sample of 332 teachers was randomly selected from a population of 935 secondary school teachers in Tehsil Rawalpindi. A constructed questionnaire was used to collect data in order to evaluate teachers' reactions of administrative assistance, their stress levels, and the connection between the two. Cronbach's Alpha was used to verify the instrument's reliability, and SPSS was used to analyze the data. The purpose of this research is to identify trends in administrative indifference and the effects it has on teachers' mental well-being and careers. The study adds to the increasing amount of research which highlights how important it is for administrators to get involved effectively in order to help teachers deal with chronically disruptive student behavior.

Keywords: Chronic disruptive student behavior; Administrative oversight & indifference; Teacher stress



Introduction

The Disruptive student behaviors are those which impede learning and teaching, and have the potential to escalate or spread if left unchecked. Most of these behaviors can be dealt with by creating a classroom environment that includes proactive methods of handling the problems. It is important to recognize the types of disruptive behaviors students are exhibiting early in the semester and act quickly to reduce problems.(Davis & Darling Hammond, 2012; iupui.edu).

In the field of education, the classroom is a microcosm where society's hopes for the next generation come together. Teachers are essential in this learning environment because they are guardians of knowledge and promoters of development. But in the noble endeavor of teaching, teachers frequently face enormous obstacles, with persistently disruptive students being one of the most common. This phenomena, which is marked by recurrent disruptions that obstruct learning, has a negative impact on teachers' well-being and morale in addition to undermining academic progress. The attitude of educational administrators to this issue has come under examination despite its frequency and negative impacts, especially in light of their oversight and lack of interest in addressing the stress that results for teachers.

Although the fact that effective classroom management is an essential element of teaching, many teachers become overwhelmed when dealing with disruptive behavior that remains, especially when there is a lack of administrative support. Teachers look to administrators, among others, to give them professional direction, emotional support, and clear disciplinary procedures. Teachers, however, frequently highlight administrative oversight or indifference, in which the administration does not step in or recognize the seriousness of the behavioral issues. Teachers' performance, morale, and mental health may suffer greatly as a result of this lack of support, which can make them feel alone and underappreciated.

Problem Statement

Teachers often encounter stress when dealing with chronically disruptive students, particularly when administrators act indifferent. The lack of support makes it harder for teachers to maintain discipline and affects their emotional well-being.

This study looks at how administrative apathy affects teachers' stress levels when dealing with persistently disruptive students.

Objectives Of The Study

1. This study has the following objectives; To identify administrative oversight and indifference on teacher stress.
2. To find out the association between administrative oversight and indifference and teacher stress in managing Chronic disruptive students' behavior.

Research Questions

The research questions of the study are;

1. What are the main causes of stress for teachers while dealing with persistently disruptive students?
2. What is the relationship between teachers' stress levels related to classroom behavior management and their perception of administrative indifference?

Research Hypotheses

H₀: There is no significant association between administration oversight and teacher stress



Literature Review

Teachers face a great deal of difficulty in dealing with students chronic disruptive behavior, which can result in extreme stress. The level of administrative help determines how much this stress is reduced or increased. This review of the literature looks at how administrative negligence and indifference affect teacher stress when it comes to dealing with students' persistently disruptive conduct.

Teachers in modern educational environments deal with a variety of issues that go beyond just passing on subject knowledge. Managing chronically disruptive student behavior is one of the most urgent and enduring problems. This is used to describe persistent, troublesome student behaviors that disrupt the teaching and learning processes in the classroom. Defiance, incessant chatter, bullying, reluctance to finish assignments, and even violent behavior are a few examples. Although student misconduct is not new, it is particularly challenging now because of its increased frequency and severity as well as the apparent or actual lack of assistance from the school administration.

Chronic Disruptive Behaviour

A Growing Concern Repeated misbehavior that interferes with learning and teaching is referred to as chronic disruptive student behavior. These are patterns of behavior rather than single occurrences, and they could involve verbal abuse, disobedience, physical violence, refusal to interact, or persistently diverting attention from other people.

According to Simonsen et al. (2008), disruptive behaviors can be divided into two categories: minor (like talking out of turn) and major (like aggression and damage). The fundamental concern emerges when these habits become persistent and habitual. Such patterns not only derail the educational experience of other students but place an undue burden on the teacher, who must juggle content delivery with behavioural correction. The efficacy of the classroom often declines as a result of instructors' lack of resources or assistance in dealing with these enduring problems.

The demands of controlling students' behavior are frequently associated with teacher stress. In addition to impeding student learning, disruptive behaviors in the classroom such as persistent disobedience, aggressiveness, and other types of disruption also put teachers under emotional and psychological stress (Klassen, 2010).

Chronic disruption has a domino effect. When one student continuously misbehaves, others can imitate the behaviour. If ignored, it creates a classroom environment where learning comes second and norms are disregarded. The teacher feels worn out, frustrated, and emotionally spent from dealing with these interruptions all the time.

When without adequate institutional support, teachers experience emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment, the three core dimensions of burnout as defined by Maslach and Jackson (1981).

The Role of Administrative Support

Administrative support is vital in establishing a productive educational environment. This support entails setting uniform behavioral policies, supporting disciplinary judgments, involving parents when necessary, and offering resources for behavior management.

Effective school leadership has a direct positive impact on teacher morale and instructional efficacy, according to Blasé & Blasé (1999). Supportive principals constantly engage with staff, are visible in classrooms, and take active roles in resolving behavioral issues. When teachers feel backed by their administration, they are more confident in managing their classrooms. Regrettably, this assistance isn't always available. Some



administrators are unable to attend to discipline-related issues because they are overworked with non-instructional duties. In others, there may be an intentional reduction of behavioral difficulties to maintain the school’s public image or prformance statistics. In either case, teachers perceive this lack of involvement as neglect.

Teachers can manage the demands of their jobs better if they have access to peer support groups, stress management programs, and counseling services. By fostering a caring and supportive work environment, administrators can put their employees' well-being first (Richards, 2012). Final Thoughts The stress that teachers experience while dealing with persistently disruptive student behavior is greatly impacted by administrative oversight and disinterest. Sufficient administrative assistance can greatly reduce teacher stress, increase work satisfaction, and boost general

Research Design

This research employ a quantitative, descriptive survey design to examine the impact of administrative indifference on teacher stressThe data were collected through a self-developed questionnaire from teachers in tehsil Rawalpindi.

Population

The target population of this study included teachers of public schools in tehsil Rawalpindi . The estimated population was approximately 935

Sample and Sampling Technique

The researcher chose a sample size of 332 teachers The researcher employed simple random sampling techniques. Simple random sampling is especially valuable in educational settings.

Research Instruments

A self-constructed, structured five likert scale questionnaire is used as research instrument. The questionnaire comprises two main variables administrative indifference and teacher stress

Reliability of Questionnaires

To assess the reliability of the scale, the researcher conducted a pilot study and calculated reliability using Cronbach's Alpha in SPSS version 23.

Table 3.1 Reliability Statistics

| Total No of Items | Cronbach Alpha Reliability |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 45 | 0.987 |

Results And Discussions

Table 4.1 Frequencies and percentages responses for communication

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|---|-----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| The administration communicates important updates regarding student behavior management effectively | 82 | 24.7 | 60 | 18.1 | 70 | 21.1 | 66 | 19.9 | 54 | 16.3 |
| I feel comfortable discussing disruptive | 174 | 52.4 | 59 | 17.8 | 55 | 16.6 | 30 | 9.0 | 14 | 4.2 |



| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|--|
| student behavior with administration. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administration provides clear guidelines on handling chronic disruptive behaviors. | 134 | 40.4 | 75 | 22.6 | 65 | 19.6 | 40 | 12.0 | 18 | 5.4 | |
| I receive timely information from administration about changes in policies related to student behavior. | 47 | 14.2 | 81 | 21.4 | 70 | 21.1 | 67 | 20.2 | 67 | 20.2 | |
| I am informed about the resources available for managing disruptive students. | 40 | 12.0 | 70 | 21 | 65 | 19 | 72 | 21 | 85 | 25.6 | |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

A significant number of teachers (42.8%) assessed this communication as rarely or never effective. Just 36.2% of respondents said it was always or mostly successful. This indicates a gap in consistent and clear communication from administration.

More than half of the teachers (52.4%) said they never felt comfortable addressing this sort of issues. Just 13.2% said they were comfortable mostly or always on a regular basis. This highlights a serious problem with trust and open communication between managers and their staff.

Total of 63% of teachers responded never or rarely to this statement. Guidelines are mostly or always clear, according to just 17.4% of respondents. This demonstrates the absence of formal administrative guidance.

According to 35.6% of teachers, they never or rarely receive such information, compared to 40.4% who say they mostly or always. This conflicting reaction demonstrates inconsistent policy communication timeliness.

I am informed about the resources available for managing disruptive students

Teachers were mostly or always informed about available resources, compared to just 33% who said they were only occasionally or never informed. Although there are still some gaps, this area has the highest rating.

Tale 4.2: Frequencies and percentages responses for support

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|---|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| The administration provides adequate support when I face challenges with disruptive students. | 94 | 28.3 | 65 | 19.6 | 60 | 18.1 | 41 | 12.3 | 72 | 28.3 |
| I have access to professional development opportunities focused on managing | 94 | 28.3 | 92 | 27.7 | 57 | 17.2 | 41 | 12.3 | 48 | 47.9 |



disruptive behavior.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|-------|
| Administration encourages collaboration among teachers to address disruptive behaviors. | 41 | 12.3 | 80 | 24.1 | 81 | 24.4 | 68 | 20.5 | 62 | 66.0 |
| I feel supported by administration when implementing strategies for behavior management. | 43 | 13.0 | 82 | 24.7 | 76 | 22.9 | 73 | 22.0 | 58 | 78.3 |
| Resources provided by administration are helpful in managing chronic disruptions. | 30 | 9.0 | 42 | 12.7 | 73 | 22.0 | 87 | 26.2 | 100 | 100.0 |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

Nearly half of the teachers (47.9%) said support is never or rarely provided. Support was rated as frequent (mostly or always) by just 22.9% of respondents. This demonstrates the obvious need for more robust administrative support during difficult times in the classroom.

More than half (56%) of teachers said they never or rarely receive such opportunities. Access was rated as frequent by just 29.5%. This suggests that behavior management training is lacking.

Just 36.4% of teachers felt collaboration was encouraged mostly or always. 36.4%, however, responded that it happened never or rarely. This suggests a divided viewpoint and draws attention to irregularities in team-building techniques.

Only 44% of respondents said they felt supported mostly or always. A similar 37.7% stated they rarely or never felt supported. This indicates a somewhat favorable but conflicted opinion on continuing help with administration.

According to the majority of teachers (48.2%), administrative resources are mostly or always beneficial. Just 21.7% said they were unhappy. This suggests that early access and equality may differ, even while overall resource quality is valued.

Table 4.3: Frequencies and percentages responses for monitoring and evaluation

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| The evaluation process for my handling of disruptive behavior is fair and transparent. | 81 | 24.4 | 93 | 28.0 | 82 | 24.7 | 45 | 13.6 | 31 | 9.3 |
| Administration provides constructive feedback on my strategies for | 40 | 12.0 | 73 | 22.0 | 77 | 23.2 | 89 | 26.8 | 53 | 16.0 |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|------|----|------|--|--|
| managing disruptive students. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I believe that administrative oversight positively influences my approach to classroom management. | 53 | 16.0 | 59 | 17.8 | 62 | 18.7 | 72 | 21.7 | 86 | 25.9 | | |
| My performance in managing disruptive behaviors is regularly monitored by administration. | 61 | 18.4 | 79 | 23.8 | 66 | 19.9 | 65 | 19.6 | 61 | 18.4 | | |
| I feel that my efforts in managing student disruptions are recognized during evaluations. | 43 | 13.0 | 56 | 16.9 | 52 | 15.7 | 125 | 37.7 | 56 | 16.9 | | |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

Significant percentage of teachers (52.4%) rated the evaluation procedure as rarely or never transparent and fair. Just 22.9% said it was always or mostly fair. This indicates discontent with and mistrust of the existing evaluation methodology.

While 42.8% of teachers stated that they received feedback mostly or always, a significant 34% stated that they did so never or rarely. This suggests some encouraging improvements, but many people still experience a lack of support.

With 47.6% agreeing (mostly or always) and 33.8% disagreeing (never or rarely), a balanced opinion was found. It also suggests that a significant number of teachers are still not persuaded, even if many of them value administrative advice.

42.2% of respondents believed that monitoring happens never or rarely, while 37.6% claimed that it happens mostly or always. This demonstrates how monitoring procedures vary throughout schools.

54.6% of teachers strongly agreed that their contributions are recognized (mostly or always). Just 29.9% said they didn't. The fact that this item has received the highest rating in this group indicates that many educators believe their efforts are appreciated.

Table 4.4: Frequencies and percentages responses for engagement

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|--|----|------|-----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | F | % | f | % | f | % | F | % | F | % |
| Administration actively engages with teachers regarding challenges faced with disruptive students. | 66 | 19.9 | 110 | 33.1 | 68 | 20.5 | 62 | 18.7 | 26 | 7.8 |
| I feel that my input | 64 | 19.3 | 78 | 23.5 | 57 | 17.2 | 60 | 18.1 | 73 | 22.0 |



| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|------|----|--|------|
| on strategies for managing disruptive behaviors is valued by administration. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administration regularly seeks feedback from teachers about student behavior issues. | 51 | 15.4 | 74 | 22.3 | 98 | 29.5 | 76 | 22.9 | 33 | | 9.9 |
| I believe that the administration is genuinely interested in understanding the challenges teachers face with disruptions. | 19 | 5.7 | 51 | 15.4 | 47 | 14.2 | 140 | 42.2 | 75 | | 22.0 |
| There are regular meetings or forums where teachers can discuss concerns about disruptive behaviors with administration. | 91 | 27.4 | 74 | 22.3 | 69 | 20.8 | 57 | 17.2 | 41 | | 12.3 |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

To this statement, almost half of the teachers (53%) gave a never or rarely response. Just 26.5% of respondents stated that interaction occurs mostly or always. This suggests a lack of administration engagement in resolving issues in the classroom.

Forty-one percent of teachers believed that their opinions are mostly or always valued, but forty-two percent claimed that this is never or rarely. This illustrates a conflicted viewpoint and implies that teachers' opinions are not always heard.

Merely 32.8% of teachers agreed that they routinely sought input (mostly or always), whereas 37.7% disagreed. This demonstrates how personnel and administration do not have regular feedback channels.

The administration demonstrates real interest, according to a huge majority (64.2%) (mostly or always). Just 21.1% were in agreement. This item has the best administrative target and is the most highly regarded in this section.

According to 49.7% of the teachers, these forums never or rarely happen. Just 29.5% of respondents claimed that they occur mostly or "always. This suggests that there aren't enough organized chances for discussion and group problem-solving.



Table 4.5: Frequencies and percentages responses for recognition

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|--|-----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | f | % | F | % | F | % | f | % | F | % |
| I feel recognized for effectively managing chronic disruptive behaviors in my classroom. | 107 | 32.2 | 80 | 24.1 | 52 | 15.7 | 50 | 15.1 | 42 | 12.7 |
| Administration acknowledges the efforts of teachers in handling disruptive students. | 66 | 19.9 | 85 | 25.6 | 46 | 13.9 | 74 | 22.3 | 61 | 18.4 |
| My contributions to improving student behavior are appreciated by administration. | 54 | 16.3 | 57 | 17.2 | 74 | 22.3 | 65 | 19.6 | 82 | 24.7 |
| I receive positive reinforcement from administration when I successfully manage disruptions. | 50 | 15.1 | 74 | 22.3 | 80 | 24.1 | 66 | 19.9 | 62 | 18.7 |
| The administration celebrates successes related to managing student behavior among staff. | 57 | 16.3 | 57 | 17.2 | 74 | 22.3 | 65 | 19.6 | 82 | 24.7 |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

The majority of teachers (56.3%) said they rarely or never felt appreciated for handling chronic interruptions. Just 27.8% said they were mostly or always recognized. This demonstrates a lack of appreciation for teachers' work.

Among the teachers who replied, 45.5% stated never or rarely, while 45.5% said mostly or always. This evenly divided response shows that different institutions have different recognition policies.

Among the respondents, more than 44.3% stated they felt appreciated mostly or always, whilst 33.5% said they did so never or rarely. Though there is certainly opportunity for development, this shows a moderate level of appreciation.

Naturally the teachers who received reinforcement mostly or always, over 42.8% did so, while 37.4% did not. According to this conflicting feedback, some administrators support positive behavior control, while others disregard it.

According to a remarkable 44.3% of teachers, their achievements are mostly or always celebrated. But 33.5% felt celebrations were lacking. This indicates moderate recognition that could be expanded to boost morale.

**Table 4.6: Frequencies and percentages responses for responsiveness**

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | F | % | f | % | f | % | F | % | F | % |
| When I report a disruptive behavior incident, administration responds promptly. | 33 | 9.9 | 77 | 23.2 | 87 | 26.2 | 69 | 20.8 | 66 | 19.9 |
| Administration takes my concerns about student behavior seriously. | 71 | 21.4 | 94 | 28.3 | 69 | 20.8 | 56 | 16.9 | 41 | 12.3 |
| I receive timely support from administration when dealing with chronic disruptions. | 77 | 23.2 | 85 | 25.6 | 58 | 17.5 | 60 | 18.1 | 51 | 15.4 |
| My suggestions for improving student behavior management are acted upon by administration. | 84 | 25.3 | 81 | 24.4 | 65 | 19.6 | 58 | 17.5 | 44 | 13.3 |
| Administration follows up on issues related to disruptive behaviors in a timely manner. | 75 | 22.6 | 75 | 21.4 | 71 | 21.5 | 58 | 17.2 | 57 | 17.2 |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

Teachers agreed (mostly or always) that responses are prompt, according to 46.1% of respondents. In contrast, 33.1% thought that answers were rarely or never" timely. Although there is potential for improvement, this indicates a moderate level of administrative responsiveness.

Nearly half of those respondents (49.7%) claimed that their issues are rarely or never taken seriously. They are mostly or always taken seriously, according to just 29.2% of respondents. This suggests a lack of credibility and trust in the way teacher concerns are addressed.

While 48.8% of instructors reported never or rarely receiving timely support, only 33.5% claimed they mostly or always got it. This demonstrates a deficiency of timely, reliable assistance in trying circumstances.

A significant number of teachers (49.7%) believed that their recommendations are rarely or never implemented. Only 30.8% of respondents experienced favorable administrative action. This suggests that teacher opinions are frequently disregarded or underappreciated.

Response comes mostly or always according to 34.4% of respondents, while 44% said never or rarely. This suggests poor administrative follow-up, which could have an impact on how issues are resolved.

**Table 4.7: Frequencies and percentages responses for teacher stress**

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|---|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | F | % | f | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| Managing chronic disruptive behaviors significantly increases my workload as a teacher. | 65 | 19.9 | 79 | 23.8 | 73 | 22.0 | 66 | 19.9 | 48 | 14.5 |
| I often spend extra time preparing materials specifically for managing disruptive students. | 55 | 16.6 | 72 | 21.7 | 78 | 23.5 | 68 | 20.5 | 59 | 17.8 |
| The demands of handling disruptive behaviors interfere with my ability to complete other teaching responsibilities. | 53 | 16.0 | 81 | 24.4 | 93 | 28.0 | 67 | 20.2 | 38 | 11.4 |
| I find it challenging to balance my workload due to the time spent on managing disruptions. | 57 | 17.2 | 68 | 20.5 | 81 | 24.4 | 68 | 20.5 | 57 | 17.2 |
| Chronic disruptions lead me to work beyond my contracted hours more frequently. | 75 | 22.6 | 88 | 26.5 | 85 | 25.6 | 45 | 13.6 | 39 | 11.7 |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

43.7% of teachers stated that this is never or rarely the case, whereas 36.4% agreed (mostly or always) that disruptions increase their workload. This suggests a subjective workload burden that is moderate to high.

The majority of teachers (44%) said they did this mostly or always, indicating that more preparation is needed for disruption management. Just 38.3% of respondents claimed that it was rarely or never required. This reveals a significant time burden on educators.

About 39.4% of teachers reported that these demands interfere mostly or always, compared to 40.4% who said that they do so never or rarely. This suggests a substantial but divided influence on day-to-day teaching responsibilities.

More over 37.7% of teachers reported having trouble balancing their workload on a regular basis, and another 37.7% said they only never or rarely had this difficulty. The nearly equal divide in the responses suggests that there may be variations based on the support or school context.



Teachers reported working extra hours mostly or always in response to disruptions, while 49.1% said they do so "never" or "rarely." This suggests it is not an issue for everyone, even though it is for some.

Table 4.8: Frequencies and percentages responses for emotional impact

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | f | % | f | % | F | % | F | % | f | % |
| I frequently experience stress due to managing disruptive behaviors in my classroom. | 69 | 20.8 | 64 | 19.3 | 84 | 25.3 | 67 | 20.2 | 48 | 14.5 |
| Dealing with chronic disruptions negatively affects my emotional well-being as a teacher. | 34 | 10.2 | 74 | 22.3 | 85 | 25.6 | 75 | 22.6 | 64 | 19.3 |
| I often feel overwhelmed by the emotional toll of handling disruptive students. | 78 | 23.5 | 71 | 21.4 | 67 | 20.2 | 62 | 18.7 | 54 | 16.3 |
| Managing chronic disruptions makes it difficult for me to maintain a positive outlook on teaching. | 66 | 19.9 | 74 | 22.3 | 80 | 24.1 | 68 | 20.5 | 44 | 13.3 |
| My emotional state is frequently impacted by the challenges posed by chronic disruptive behaviors. | 57 | 17.2 | 67 | 20.2 | 82 | 24.7 | 78 | 23.5 | 48 | 14.5 |

Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always
60% of teachers showed they experienced stress often, mostly, or always, compared to 40.1% who said they did so never or rarely. This demonstrates clearly that one of the main causes of teacher stress is disruptive behavior.



Only 32.5% of teachers said that disruptions never or rarely had a negative impact on their emotional health, compared to more than two-thirds (67.5%) who agreed. This demonstrates the significant emotional toll that chronic behavior among students takes.

Teachers reported feeling emotionally overwhelmed often or more in 55.2% of cases, compared to 44.9% who said they felt this way never or rarely. This suggests that most teachers endure a significant emotional toll.

Teachers reported feeling emotionally overwhelmed often or more in 55.2% of cases, compared to 44.9% who said they felt this way never or rarely. This suggests that most instructors endure a significant emotional toll.

Teachers' outlooks are negatively impacted often or more, according to just over 57.9% of them, whereas 42.2% said this occurs rarely or never. According to this research, interruptions may have a major impact on teachers' motivation and job satisfaction.

A total of 62.7% of teachers reported that their emotional state is affected often, mostly, or always while only 37.4% said never or rarely. This suggests that teachers frequently worry about the emotional toll of dealing with disruptive conduct, which may have an impact on their general wellbeing and effectiveness.

Table 4.9: Frequencies and percentages responses for job satisfaction

| Statements | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| | f | % | F | % | F | % | f | % | F | % |
| Overall, I am satisfied with my teaching role despite the challenges posed by disruptive student behavior. | 74 | 22.3 | 63 | 19.0 | 74 | 22.3 | 65 | 19.6 | 56 | 16.9 |
| The stress from managing chronic disruptions affects my overall job satisfaction negatively. | 70 | 21.1 | 71 | 21.4 | 81 | 25.6 | 64 | 19.3 | 41 | 12.3 |
| I would consider leaving the teaching profession due to the stress associated with managing disruptive students. | 74 | 22.3 | 99 | 29.8 | 87 | 26.2 | 45 | 13.6 | 27 | 8.1 |
| My experiences with chronic disruptions make me question my commitment to teaching as a career. | 62 | 18.7 | 81 | 24.4 | 83 | 25.0 | 64 | 19.3 | 42 | 12.7 |
| Despite the challenges, I still find fulfillment in teaching, even when managing disruptions. | 35 | 10.5 | 83 | 25.0 | 70 | 21.1 | 76 | 22.9 | 68 | 20.5 |



Note: 1 = Never, 2 = rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Mostly, and 5 = Always

41.3% of teachers said they were satisfied never or rarely, compared to just 36.5% who said they were highly satisfied (mostly or always). This demonstrates how disruptive behaviors have a major impact on a large group of teachers' overall job satisfaction.

Stress from disruptions reduces job satisfaction, according to more than half (57.2%) of respondents (often to always). This demonstrates a direct correlation between persistent behavioral problems and low teacher morale.

Teachers often, mostly, or always consider quitting their jobs because of disruption-related stress, according to a concerning 47.9% of respondents. Just 22.3% opposed the notion. This indicates that teacher commitment is seriously threatened.

44.3% of the teachers said they questioned their career commitment mostly or more, compared to 43.1% who said they did so never or rarely. This shows how frequent disruptions have a major emotional and professional impact.

A positive 43.4% of teachers said they were satisfied mostly or always, despite difficulties. But 35.5% responded with never or rarely. This suggests that even when disruptions affect test teachers' job satisfaction, many of them still find meaning in their work.

Examines the administrative indifference with teacher stress and its association : its impact on teacher stress

| Administrative indifference | Teacher | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------|------|
| | Low | Medium | High |
| | Percentages | | |
| Low | 46.2 | 57.4 | 15.7 |
| Medium | 44.9 | 55.7 | 56.9 |
| High | 9.0 | 7.9 | 5.9 |

X^2 Tab. = 9.488, X^2 Cal., = 3.156, df = 4, result = non-significant

At the 5% significance level, there is no statistically significant association with teacher stress and administration indifference.

This indicates that although while the descriptive percentages point to a chance (for example, that increased communication is associated with less stress), the statistical strength of the relationship is insufficient to support a significant association in this sample.

Discussion

The findings underscore the urgent need for leadership education in schools, emphasizing emotional intelligence, empathy, and visibility. By investing in administrative capacity to nurture teacher morale, educational institutions can create sustainable environments where both teachers and students thrive.

The findings also showed that teachers' emotional perspective and feeling of purpose in their work are directly impacted by administrative engagement, or the extent to which administrators are involved in the day-to-day operations of the school. Teachers felt emotionally safe and appreciated in their work when they indicated that their administrators were actively involved, whether through regular check-ins, classroom inspections, or visible leadership amid kid emergencies. These educators were less likely to show signs of emotional distance or disinterest in their jobs. By fostering an environment of mutual respect and shared accountability, engagement lessened the psychological toll



of feeling isolated while dealing with challenging student conduct . Teachers who encountered administrative disengagement , on the other hand , expressed a great deal of annoyance , emotional disengagement , and a decline in job satisfaction.

Therefore , the role of school leadership must extend beyond managerial duties to include emotional engagement , proactive oversight , and collaborative problem-solving with teaching staff . Schools must place a high priority on administrative responsiveness , organized communication systems , and ongoing professional development in behavior management in order to protect teachers' well-being and preserve a steady , effective learning environment . Meeting the practical and emotional needs of educators is essential to the long-term viability of educational institutions and goes beyond workplace ethics.

Conclusion

This study has underscored the profound impact of administrative indifference on teacher stress, particularly in the context of managing chronic disruptive student behavior. The evidence suggests that when school administrators are disengaged, emotionally distant, or fail to communicate and support staff consistently, teachers are left to navigate complex behavioral challenges alone. Teachers' experiences of isolation, professional discontent, and emotional tiredness are all greatly heightened by this lack of support.

Teachers who sense administrative indifference frequently express feelings of emotional detachment from their work, undervaluation, and lack of support. On the other hand, people who are exposed to administrative presence through clear leadership, sympathetic communication, and participation in daily issues generally report feeling less stressed and more purposeful. likely to express a greater feeling of purpose and reduced stress. This difference shows that administrative behavior has a major role in determining teachers' job happiness and well-being rather than being a side problem.

Schools must place a high priority on administrative involvement that is behaviorally proactive, emotionally responsive, and continuously supportive in order to effectively address teacher stress. Maintaining a positive educational climate and preventing teacher burnout require developing an organizational culture based on empathy, transparency, and reciprocal accountability. In the end, lowering teacher stress necessitates not only personal fortitude but also structural adjustments in leadership styles that place an emphasis on teachers' emotional and professional needs as the cornerstone of academic achievement.

References

- Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational psychology review*
- Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational psychology review*, 26(1), 101-126
- Richards, J. (2012, July). Teacher stress and coping strategies: A national snapshot. In *The educational forum* (Vol. 76, No. 3, pp. 299-316). Taylor & Francis Group
- Davis, S. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Innovative principal preparation programs: What works and how we know. *Planning and changing*, 43, 25-45.
- J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational administration quarterly*, 35(3), 349-378.
- Klassen, R. M. (2010). Teacher stress: The mediating role of collective efficacy beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103(5), 342-350



- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2003). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning*. Corwin Press
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. *Education and treatment of children*, 31(3), 351-380.