

# TEACHING EFFICACY AND WORK PERFORMANCE OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER THE ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

**Rosa Mae T. Breguera**

rosamae.ty@deped.gov.ph

**East Bajac-Bajac Elementary School, Olongapo City, Zambales, 2200, Philippines**

---

## ABSTRACT

*This study examined the impact of alternative work arrangements on teaching efficacy and work performance of 173 elementary school teachers in District II-A, Schools Division Office of Olongapo City. Using a descriptive-correlation method and survey via Google Forms, data were analyzed with frequency, percentage, mean, Likert scale, ANOVA, and Pearson r. Findings revealed that most teachers reported to school twice weekly and worked from home three times weekly. Teachers demonstrated efficiency in course design, technology use, interpersonal relationships, and learning assessment, with majority achieving outstanding performance under the alternative work setup. No significant difference was found in teaching efficacy across work arrangements, except in technology use, where reporting twice or four times weekly showed variation. Moreover, no correlation existed between alternative work arrangements, work performance, and teaching efficacy. Recommendations include optimizing reporting schedules, improving internet connectivity, and providing training to enhance teaching efficacy and performance.*

**Keywords:** *Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA), Teaching Efficacy, Work Performance*

---

## INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has drastically altered the landscape of education worldwide, forcing institutions to adapt to new and flexible work arrangements in order to sustain the delivery of quality instruction. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented Alternative

Work Arrangements (AWA) through DepEd Order No. 11, s. 2020. These arrangements included skeleton workforce reporting, work-from-home setups, four-day workweeks with staggered hours, and other flexible schedules based on community quarantine guidelines and the nature of tasks. While necessary, these adjustments brought significant implications for teaching efficacy and overall work performance among teachers.

Teaching efficacy is strongly influenced by subjective well-being and self-efficacy, which shape teachers' motivation, goals, and classroom practices. The uncertainty brought about by the pandemic, coupled with the demands of remote and modular teaching, presented teachers with unprecedented challenges. As education systems struggled to maintain continuity, teachers were

expected to balance professional responsibilities with personal well-being, highlighting the critical link between work arrangements, teaching efficacy, and performance.

Globally, the pandemic underscored the vulnerability of education systems during public health crises. Studies have shown that pandemics and stressful life events negatively affect mental health, psychological functioning, and workplace productivity (Yildirim & Arslan, 2020; Saleem, 2021). In the Philippines, teachers not only had to deliver lessons through modular and online platforms but also took on additional responsibilities such as module reproduction, distribution, and retrieval, alongside attending webinars and responding to parents and students virtually. These shifts required educators to embrace technology and adapt rapidly to the “new normal” of education.

In this context, a new performance standard for teachers was also introduced, placing emphasis on achieving outstanding results despite the limitations posed by flexible work arrangements. Recognizing these challenges, this study seeks to provide valuable insights that the Department of Education may use to refine policies, ensuring that both the needs of teachers and the demands of quality education are adequately addressed.

Therefore, this study aimed to examine the effect of Alternative Work Arrangements on the teaching efficacy and work performance of elementary school teachers in District II-A of the Schools Division Office of Olongapo City.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study investigated the effect of alternative work arrangements in teaching efficacy and alternative work performance of elementary school teachers in the District II-A of Schools Division Office of Olongapo City.

Specifically, it sought to find out the following:

1. What are the Alternative Work Arrangements do teachers have in terms of number of days reporting to school?
2. What level of teaching efficacy do teachers have in terms of:
  - 2.1 course design;
  - 2.2 technology use;
  - 2.3 interpersonal relation; and
  - 2.4 learning assessment?
3. What is the work performance of teachers under Alternative Work Arrangements?
4. Is there a significant difference between teaching efficacy of teachers when grouped according to their alternative work arrangements?
5. Is there a significant relationship between alternative work arrangements and work performance of teachers?
6. Is there a significant relationship between teaching efficacy and work performance of teachers?

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design, which collects data without altering the subjects to determine relationships between variables and make predictions. This approach, as explained by Bueno and Matriano (2016), often uses surveys and existing records. In this study, the researcher examined the effects of Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA) on teaching efficacy and work performance of elementary teachers. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire administered via Google Forms, then analyzed, interpreted, and reported to address the research objectives.

### Respondents and Location

The respondents were the 173 elementary school teachers of District II-A, Schools Division Office of Olongapo City, representing the entire teacher population employed. Coordination with principals facilitated communication and survey administration. The study covered four public schools: Sta. Rita Elementary School (57 teachers, 33%), Balic-Balic Elementary School (42 teachers, 24%), Tabacuhan Elementary School (40 teachers, 23%), and Gordon Heights II Elementary School (34 teachers, 20%).

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of the Respondents per School**

| Name of School                      | Number of Teachers | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Sta. Rita Elementary School         | 57                 | 33         |
| Balic-Balic Elementary School       | 42                 | 24         |
| Tabacuhan Elementary School         | 40                 | 23         |
| Gordon Heights II Elementary School | 34                 | 20         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                        | <b>173</b>         | <b>100</b> |

### Data Collection

The study used a researcher-made questionnaire with three parts. The first covered teachers' Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA) in terms of reporting days. The second measured teaching efficacy across course design, technology use, interpersonal relations, and learning assessment, rated on a 4-point Likert scale. Standard tools were adapted, including the Teacher Educator Technology Competencies (Foulger et al., 2017) and the Interpersonal Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (Veldman, 2017). The third part assessed teachers' work performance using their IPCRF ratings. Validity and reliability were ensured through expert review, pilot testing with 20 teachers, and consultation with a data analyst. Reliability tests showed excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha: 0.94–0.98). Revisions were made before finalizing the instrument.

After thesis approval, the researcher secured authorization from the Graduate School and the Schools Division Office of Olongapo City, with endorsement from the Superintendent and District Supervisor. Letters were then sent to principals for permission to administer the survey. The questionnaire, distributed via Google Forms through principals and teachers' group chats, was allotted 15 days for retrieval, ensuring 100% response rate.

### Data Analysis

The collected data were organized, tabulated, and analyzed using SPSS version 26 at a 0.05 significance level. Statistical tools included: frequency and percentage (respondent distribution), weighted mean (teaching efficacy), ANOVA (differences in efficacy by AWA), and Pearson r (relationships among AWA, teaching efficacy, and work performance). Correlation strength followed Bueno and Matriano (2016). Teaching efficacy was rated on a 4-point Likert scale (Very Efficient–Not Efficient), while work performance was interpreted using DepEd Memorandum 0498 s. 2021 (Outstanding–Poor).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This presents the data gathered and their subsequent analysis and interpretation. The data obtained from the responses in the questionnaires were properly tabulated, organized and analyzed for interpretation with the use of appropriate statistical measures.

### *Alternative Work Arrangements*

Tables 2 and 3 are the responses that were tabulated and analyzed by the researcher. These are the data that came from the questionnaire and it embodied one-third of the research proper.

Table 2 shows that most of the teachers were reported to school twice a week with 59 out of 173 or 34%. It was followed by thrice, four times a week, once a week and not reporting with 53, 52, 7 and 2 respectively. In summary, it shows that teachers were reported to school 2.84 or thrice a week.

**Table 2**  
**Alternative Work Arrangements of Teachers (No. of Days Reporting to School)**

| Alternative Work Arrangements of Teachers<br>(no. of days reported to school) | Frequency   | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| 4                                                                             | 52          | 30         |
| 3                                                                             | 53          | 31         |
| 2                                                                             | 59          | 34         |
| 1                                                                             | 7           | 4          |
| 0                                                                             | 2           | 1          |
| <b>Total</b>                                                                  | <b>173</b>  | <b>100</b> |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                                   | <b>2.84</b> |            |

Compressed work weeks are policies that need the identical number of hours hebdomadally, however, the hours are often worked in but the standard number of workdays (Allen, 2013).

Table 3 shows that most of the teachers were in work-from-home thrice a week with 59 out of 173 or 34%. It was followed by twice, once a week, four times a week and five times a week with 53, 52, 7 and 2 respectively. In summary, it shows that teachers were reported to school 2.16 or twice a week.

**Table 3**  
**Alternative Work Arrangements of Teachers (No. of Days in Work-from-Home)**

| Alternative Work Arrangements of Teachers<br>(no. of days in work-from-home) | Frequency   | Percentage |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| 5                                                                            | 2           | 1          |
| 4                                                                            | 7           | 4          |
| 3                                                                            | 59          | 34         |
| 2                                                                            | 53          | 31         |
| 1                                                                            | 52          | 30         |
| <b>Total</b>                                                                 | <b>173</b>  | <b>100</b> |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                                  | <b>2.16</b> |            |

Flexible Work Hours was the optimum AWA for both the staff and managers (Realon, 2018). Flextime allows employees to change the days at which they're going to perform their jobs; however, they're still liable for working the designated length of your time (Higgins, Duxbury, & Julien, 2014).

#### *Teaching Efficacy*

- Course Design: Teachers were *efficient* (mean = 3.41), strongest in providing clear explanations and weakest in arranging topics logically.
- Technology Use: Rated *efficient* (mean = 3.19), strongest in instructional design but weakest in troubleshooting.
- Interpersonal Relation: Rated *very efficient* (mean = 3.50), strongest in assisting students and adhering to policy, weakest in school awareness.
- Learning Assessment: Rated *efficient* (mean = 3.39), strongest in checking outputs, weakest in online communication and feedback.
- Overall: Teachers were *efficient* (mean = 3.36), strongest in interpersonal relations, weakest in technology use.

Table 4 shows the Summary of the teaching efficacy of elementary school teachers.

**Table 4**  
**Summary of the Teaching Efficacy**

| Teaching Efficacies       | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Rating | Rank |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| 1. Course Design          | 3.41          | Efficient          | 2    |
| 2. Technology Use         | 3.19          | Efficient          | 4    |
| 3. Interpersonal Relation | 3.50          | Very Efficient     | 1    |
| 4. Learning Assessment    | 3.39          | Efficient          | 3    |
| <b>Grand Mean</b>         | <b>3.36</b>   | <b>Efficient</b>   |      |

Teachers are very efficient in terms of interpersonal relation with a mean of 3.50. However, it was found out that majority of the teachers are efficient in terms of technology use with a mean of 3.19. In summary, majority of the teachers are efficient in teaching with a mean of 3.36. It shows that teachers are efficient in relation to others, course designing, assessment and using technology in facilitating lessons and assessments.

Cardullo (2021) revealed that disadvantages of remote teaching included teachers' level of self-efficacy in using technology to show, lack of support and resources to show online and also the struggle to motivate and interact students. Baloran (2021) revealed that self-efficacy significantly influences the work commitment of public-school teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Bedir (2015) revealed that teachers mostly regard themselves as efficient especially in school management dimension.

### *Work Performance of Teachers Under Alternative Work Arrangements*

Teachers are outstanding with 131 out of 173 or 76%. It was followed by very satisfactory with 42 out of 173 or 24%. The good thing is that no teachers have a satisfactory to poor work performance. In summary, majority of the teachers have an outstanding work performance of teachers under Alternative Work Arrangements a mean of 4.63. It shows that teachers are outstanding in the three key result areas such as content knowledge and pedagogy, diversity of learners and assessment and reporting and curriculum and planning.

Teachers believed that while they were on alternative work arrangement, they might still be 'productive' (Development Academy of the Philippines, 2020). Teachers also agreed that alternative work arrangement was contributory factor to the growing balance of family and work life (Tacadao, 2020). The finding is similar to the study of Simbillo (2019) that majority of the teachers have outstanding work performance. However, the study contradicts to the study of Cangco (2020) and Concepcion (2020).

### *Difference between teaching efficacy of teachers when grouped according to their AWA*

Table 5 reflects the summary of ANOVA on the difference between teaching efficacy of teachers when grouped according to their alternative work arrangements.

**Table 5**  
**Summary of the Difference between teaching efficacy of teachers when grouped according to their alternative work arrangements**

| Teaching Efficacy          | Source of Variation | SS      | Df  | MS     | F      | P-value | F crit | Decision/ Interpretation   |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|---------|--------|----------------------------|
| Course Design              | treatment           | 1.0066  | 4   | 0.2517 | 1.0623 | 0.3769  | 2.425  | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
|                            | Error               | 39.8001 | 168 | 0.2369 |        |         |        |                            |
|                            | Total               | 40.8067 | 172 |        |        |         |        |                            |
| Technology Use             | treatment           | 2.4193  | 4   | 0.6048 | 2.4222 | 0.0503  | 2.425  | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
|                            | Error               | 41.9494 | 168 | 0.2497 |        |         |        |                            |
|                            | Total               | 44.3687 | 172 |        |        |         |        |                            |
| Interpersonal Relation     | treatment           | 0.4659  | 4   | 0.1165 | 0.6024 | 0.6615  | 2.425  | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
|                            | Error               | 32.4827 | 168 | 0.1933 |        |         |        |                            |
|                            | Total               | 32.9486 | 172 |        |        |         |        |                            |
| Learning Assessment        | treatment           | 1.2145  | 4   | 0.3036 | 1.5360 | 0.1940  | 2.425  | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
|                            | Error               | 33.2085 | 168 | 0.1977 |        |         |        |                            |
|                            | Total               | 34.4230 | 172 |        |        |         |        |                            |
| Over-all Teaching Efficacy | treatment           | 0.6608  | 4   | 0.1652 | 1.0159 | 0.4007  | 2.425  | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
|                            | error               | 27.3203 | 168 | 0.1626 |        |         |        |                            |
|                            | total               | 27.9811 | 172 |        |        |         |        |                            |

*Significant at 0.05*

The data shows that there is no significant difference between teaching efficacy of teachers when grouped according to their alternative work arrangements. Since the computed F-values are

lesser than the critical F-value, the hypothesis is accepted. It shows that alternative work arrangements do not affect the teaching efficacy of teachers.

However, using Tukey HSD, it was found out that there is a significant difference between the teaching efficacy of teachers in terms of Technology Use and reporting to school twice and four times a week. Since the computed p value of 0.0422 is less than 0.05, hypothesis is rejected.

The existence of positive impact for AWA on workers' Motivation, Performance, Retention and Work-Life Balance with an overall weighted mean of 3.94. Flexible Work Hours was the optimum AWA for both the staff and managers (Realon, 2018). Flextime allows employees to change the days at which they're going to perform their jobs; however, they're still liable for working the designated length of your time (Higgins, Duxbury, & Julien, 2014).

#### *Relationship Between AWA and Work Performance*

Table 6 reflects the summary of relationship between Alternative Work Arrangements and work performance of teachers.

**Table 6**  
**Summary Table for the Relationship Between Alternative Work Arrangements and Work Performance of Teachers**

| Degree of Freedom | Computed r | P Value  | Critical Value | Decision                   |
|-------------------|------------|----------|----------------|----------------------------|
| 171               | -0.038151  | 0.618240 | 0.125          | Accept Ho, Not Significant |

*Significant at 0.05*

The study found no significant correlation between Alternative Work Arrangements and the Work Performance of teachers. With  $r = -0.038151$ ,  $df = 171$ , and  $p = 0.618240$  (greater than 0.05), the null hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that teachers' work performance is not influenced by the number of days they report to school.

Teachers believed that while they were on alternative work arrangement, they might still be 'productive' (Development Academy of the Philippines, 2020).

#### *Relationship Between Teaching Efficacy and Work Performance*

Table 7 shows the summary computation of relationship between teaching efficacy and work performance of teachers.

**Table 7**  
**Summary Table for the Relationship Between Teaching Efficacy and Work Performance of Teachers**

| Teaching Efficacy          | Degree of Freedom | Computed r | P Value  | Critical Value | Decision                   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|----------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Course Design              | 171               | 0.036317   | 0.635240 | 0.125          | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
| Technology use             |                   | -0.136426  | 0.073490 |                | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
| Interpersonal Relationship |                   | 0.098679   | 0.196473 |                | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
| Learning Assessment        |                   | 0.019410   | 0.799905 |                | Accept Ho, Not Significant |
| Over-all Teaching Efficacy |                   | 0.000168   | 0.998246 |                | Accept Ho, Not Significant |

*Significant at 0.05*

It can be viewed that there is no correlation between Teaching Efficacy and Work Performance of Teachers. Computing the significance of  $r$ , with degrees of freedom of  $173-2 = 171$  and  $r$  of Course Design is 0.036317, Technology use is -0.136426, Interpersonal Relationship is 0.098679 and Learning Assessment is 0.019410 and the Over-all Teaching Efficacy is 0.000168. Since the computed  $r$  is less than the tabular value of 0.125 and the  $p$ -values are greater than the 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. This shows that Work Performance is not dependent to Teaching Efficacy. The highness and lowness of work performance of teachers is not affected by their teaching efficacy.

Barni (2019) showed that teachers' conservation values were positively associated to sense of self-efficacy regardless of the type and level of motivation for teaching. Kasalak (2020) showed that there is a relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction.

## CONSLUSION

The study concluded that most teachers reported to school twice a week and worked from home thrice weekly under Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA). Teachers were generally efficient in course design, technology use, interpersonal relations, and learning assessment, with the majority receiving outstanding work performance ratings. No significant differences in teaching efficacy were found across AWAs, except in technology use between those reporting twice and four times weekly. Furthermore, no correlation existed between AWA and work performance, nor between teaching efficacy and work performance. In light of these findings, it is recommended that teachers maintain a balanced reporting schedule to reduce costs and energy use. School heads should provide training on teaching efficacy, ensure reliable internet connectivity, revisit reporting policies, and continue motivating teachers toward outstanding performance. Teachers are also encouraged to pursue seminars, workshops, and graduate studies. Further similar studies with broader scope are suggested to validate and expand these results.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher sincerely extends her deepest gratitude to all who have contributed to the successful completion of this thesis. Foremost, heartfelt appreciation is given to her adviser, Dr. Ivy Hipolito

Casupanan, whose invaluable guidance, insightful suggestions, and unwavering patience provided both direction and inspiration throughout the study.

Special thanks are also due to Dr. Roy N. Villalobos and Dr. Marie Fe D. De Guzman for their exemplary leadership and support, and to Dr. Rosario D. Dacuno, Mr. Guillermo O. Andres, and Mr. Raymond D. Espiritu, whose constructive evaluation and recommendations during the oral defense greatly enhanced the quality of this work. The researcher also gratefully acknowledges Dr. Arnold D. Alvaro for his expertise and assistance in the statistical analyses.

This study would not have been possible without the permission and support of the Department of Education–Olongapo City, which provided the opportunity to conduct the research. The researcher also expresses profound appreciation to her parents, Vicente M. Ty and the late Celia P. Ty, her siblings, and Paulo A. Breguera, for their unconditional love, encouragement, and understanding throughout this journey.

Above all, the researcher offers her utmost thanks to Almighty God, whose grace, wisdom, and blessings made every step of this endeavor possible.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, T. (2013). Work-family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 345-376. doi: 10.1111/peps.12012. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-17868-002>
- Baloran, E. (2021). Crisis Self-Efficacy and Work Commitment of Education Workers among Public Schools during COVID-19 Pandemic. <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202007.0599/v1/download>
- Barni, D. (2019). Teachers' Self-Efficacy: The Role of Personal Values and Motivations for Teaching. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01645/full>
- Bedir, G. (2015). Perception of Teaching Efficacy by Primary and Secondary School Teachers. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1078840.pdf>
- Bueno, D. & Matriano, E. (2016). *Essentials of statistics*. Columban College Inc. Olongapo City.
- Bueno, D. & Matriano, E. (2016). *Methods of Research*. Columban College Inc. Olongapo City.
- Bydén, M. (2016). Flexible work arrangements: Stress-buffering or stress exacerbation? <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/79175471.pdf>

- Cangco, M. (2020). Inquiry Based Instruction and Teachers' Performance. Far East Adventist School of Theology International Inc. Cavite, Philippines.
- Cardullo, V. (2021). K-12 teachers' remote teaching self-efficacy during the pandemic. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JRIT-10-2020-0055/full/html>
- DepEd Website (2020). DepEd Order 11, 2020 (Revised Guidelines on Alternative Work Arrangements in the Department of Education During the Period of State of National Emergency Due to COVID-19 Pandemic). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/06/15/do-011-s-2020/>
- DepEd Website (2021). DepEd Memorandum 0498 s 2021. [https://www.depedcar.ph/sites/default/files/announcementFiles/dm-phrod-2021-0498\\_issuance\\_of\\_the\\_e-ipcrf\\_ande-sat\\_consolidation\\_tool\\_for\\_school\\_year\\_2020-2021.pdf](https://www.depedcar.ph/sites/default/files/announcementFiles/dm-phrod-2021-0498_issuance_of_the_e-ipcrf_ande-sat_consolidation_tool_for_school_year_2020-2021.pdf)
- Development Academy of the Philippines (2020). Survey on alternative work arrangement (AWA and its effect on public sector performance and productivity. <https://coepsp.dap.edu.ph/research-program/>
- Foulger, T., Graziano, K., Schmidt-Crawford, D. & Slykhuis, D. (2017). Teacher Educator Technology Competencies. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 25(4), 413-448. Waynesville, NC USA: Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education. Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/181966/>.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Julien, M. (2014). The relationship between work arrangements and work-family conflict. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24763353/>
- Kasalak, G. (2020). The Relationship between Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis of the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1261816.pdf>
- Realon, J. (2018). A study on the optimum alternative work arrangement and its impact with the motivation, performance and retention of IT sector employees in Metro Manila. [https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/etd\\_masteral/5519/](https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/etd_masteral/5519/)
- Simbillo, L. (2019). Ethical Behavior and Teaching Performance. Far East Adventist School of Theology International Inc. Cavite, Philippines.
- Tacadao, M. (2020). A descriptive study on off-site work arrangement in the Philippines. Department of Labor and Employment. <https://ils.dole.gov.ph/a-descriptive-study-on-offsite-work-arrangement-in-the-philippines/>

Veldman, I. (2017). Interpersonal self-efficacy Questionnaire.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316288086\\_Measuring\\_teachers'\\_interpersonal\\_s  
elf-  
efficacy\\_relationship\\_with\\_realized\\_interpersonal\\_aspirations\\_classroom\\_management\\_eff  
icacy\\_and\\_age](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316288086_Measuring_teachers'_interpersonal_self-efficacy_relationship_with_realized_interpersonal_aspirations_classroom_management_efficacy_and_age)

Yıldırım, M. & Arslan, G. (2020). A Moderated Mediation Effect of Stress-Related Growth and Meaning in Life in the Association Between Coronavirus Suffering and Satisfaction With Life: Development of the Stress-Related Growth Measure.  
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648236/full>