

TEACHER PRESENTEEISM AND PEDAGOGICAL LITERACY OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Leslie A. Pairat^a and Michaelson Jasper P. Duyan^b

^a *leslie_pairat@sjp2cd.edu.ph*

^b *michaelsonjasper_duyan@sjp2cd.edu.ph*

^a *Ecoland Drive Corner Quimpo Boulevard, Matina, Davao City, 8000, Philippines.*

^b *Ecoland Drive Corner Quimpo Boulevard, Matina, Davao City, 8000, Philippines.*

Abstract

The primary purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy. There is an indication that certain aspects of teacher presenteeism are associated with specific dimensions of pedagogical literacy. This study employed a non-experimental quantitative research design, using descriptive-correlational and comparative methods. Complete enumeration sampling was used to select the respondents, and survey questionnaires were used to collect the data. The mean and standard deviation, Pearson *r*, and ANOVA were the statistical tools used to address the research objectives. Findings revealed that the levels of teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy are very high. Results showed no significant differences in teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy when analyzed by length of service. This implies that significant relationships exist among specific indicators, although no significant relationship was found between the overall variables.

Keywords: Teacher presenteeism, pedagogical literacy, Davao City, Philippines

1. Rationale

Pedagogical literacy is a vital aspect of teacher competence, involving the effective application of educational theories and strategies in real classroom situations (Koçoğlu, 2022). In Turkey, teachers had a strong theoretical understanding but struggled to design instruction that met the needs of diverse learners (Sarı & Duran, 2022). In the Philippines, academic personnel experienced difficulties in lesson planning, classroom management, and assessment, revealing a gap between theory and practice (Abao et al., 2022). Locally, in Davao City, although schools have improved their professional development programs, teachers still struggle to apply learner-centered strategies in the classroom (Garcia & Juliani, 2024). Moreover, studies show that limited mentorship and guidance make it harder for teachers to develop effective teaching skills and knowledge (Clarion & Paralisan, 2023). Teacher presenteeism happens when teachers continue working even when they are physically or mentally unwell, which can affect their health and working performance (Biron, 2022). In Ethiopia, many teachers continue to teach even when they are sick, which can lead to reduced classroom engagement and poor lesson delivery (Mamaye, 2024). In the Philippines, teachers were also found to continue working despite fatigue and health problems due to work demands and a lack of substitute systems (Garcia & Juliani, 2024). In Davao City, academic personnel faced similar problems, as heavy workloads and stress affected their focus and teaching effectiveness (Clarion & Paralisan, 2023). Studies also indicate that regularly working while unwell can increase the risk of burnout, fatigue, and long-term health problems among educators (Padmanabhanunni & Pretorius, 2023).

Teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy are closely interconnected. Teachers who experience stress, fatigue, or illness often struggle to plan effective lessons and make good teaching decisions and strategies (Wang et al., 2023). High levels of presenteeism, such as difficulty focusing on work, coping with stress, social loafing, and reduced performance, are associated with lower levels of

pedagogical literacy in the areas of learning–teaching processes, classroom management, measurement and evaluation, and counseling, which are key elements of pedagogical literacy (Clarion & Paralisan, 2023). On the other hand, teachers with strong pedagogical literacy are better able to manage stress and maintain high-quality teaching even in challenging situations (Lao, 2024). This relationship suggests that a teacher's well-being directly influences their instructional competence.

Although many studies have examined teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy separately, only a few have examined how these two variables relate, particularly among academic personnel in the Philippines (Alcazaren, 2024). Most international research focuses on in-service teachers, overlooking how health and wellness issues affect those working at the academic level (Wang et al., 2023). Locally, there is limited evidence from Davao City on how presenteeism affects the pedagogical literacy of academic personnel (Garcia & Juliani, 2024). This research is urgent because understanding this relationship can help educational institutions design programs that strengthen both the well-being and teaching competence of academic personnel (Serya, 2025).

2. Research Objective

The purpose of the study was to determine the significant relationship between teacher presenteeism and their pedagogical literacy. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following objectives:

1. to describe the level of teacher presenteeism of academic personnel in terms of the following:
 - 1.1. focus on work,
 - 1.2. coping with stress,
 - 1.3. social loafing, and
 - 1.4. performance;
2. to ascertain the level of pedagogical literacy of academic personnel in terms of the following:
 - 2.1. learning teaching process,
 - 2.2. class management,
 - 2.3. measurement and evaluation, and
 - 2.4. counseling;
3. to test the significant difference in the teacher presenteeism and their pedagogical literacy when grouped according to length of service; and
4. to determine the significant relationship between teacher presenteeism and their pedagogical literacy.

3. Methodology

An outline of the study's methodology is presented in this chapter. This chapter is organized around the study's research design, research respondents, research locale, research instrument, data collection, and statistical tools.

3.1 Research Design

This study uses a non-experimental quantitative research design, a systematic approach for collecting and analyzing numerical data to understand relationships, patterns, and trends among variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). It emphasizes objectivity and statistical analysis, making it a suitable approach for studies that aim to measure and examine cause-and-effect relationships. This study will also employ a moderation analysis, a method used to determine whether the relationship between an independent variable (Teacher Presenteeism) and a dependent variable (Pedagogical Literacy) is moderated through a third variable (length of service)

A descriptive correlational design was used in this study to examine the relationships between teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy. Descriptive correlational research identifies patterns and associations between variables without manipulating them, making it an appropriate approach for understanding naturally occurring relationships (Fraenkel et al., 1993). This design is particularly relevant for this study, as it aims to assess whether Teacher Presenteeism significantly predicts Pedagogical Literacy and whether there is a significant difference when grouped by length of service. By using this approach, the

study provided empirical evidence of how these variables interact among academic personnel across different institutions.

3.1 Data Collection

The data collection process for this study follows a systematic, organized approach to ensure the accuracy and credibility of the information collected. The researcher first consulted with the research adviser to refine the methodology and align it with the study's objectives. The survey questionnaires on teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy were validated by a panel of experts to ensure clarity, relevance, and consistency. After validation, permission from institutional authorities was obtained to conduct the study in accordance with ethical standards. These steps ensured that the tools and procedures used to gather data are reliable and appropriate for the study.

Once approval is granted, the data were collected through face-to-face surveys conducted with academic personnel at a private institution during the 2025–2026 academic year. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study and provided a consent before completing the questionnaires. The face-to-face method allowed the researcher to clarify instructions and minimize possible misunderstandings in the responses. The gathered information were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to ensure valid and meaningful results.

4. RESULTS

Table 1 shows the overall level of teacher presenteeism among academic personnel, with a mean rating of 3.66, indicating a very high level. This indicates that teacher presenteeism is consistently observed among the respondents. The overall computed standard deviation of 0.216 indicates that individual responses were closely clustered around the mean.

An examination of the results revealed the items with the highest mean ratings for each of the indicators are: for Focus on Work, *feeling energetic enough to finish the task and staying focused on work without getting distracted*, which both have a mean rating of 3.69 and standard deviations of 0.667 and 0.523 respectively, described as *very high*; for Coping with Stress, *maintaining good relationships with colleagues (mentors)*, with a mean of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.419, described as *very high*; for Social Loafing, *performing tasks even without supervision*, with a mean of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.460, described as *very high*; and for Performance, *taking the job seriously*, with a mean of 3.89 and a standard deviation of 0.318, described as *very high*.

Conversely, the item with the lowest mean rating for *finishing work on time*, which has a mean of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.580, as indicators are :

Table 1

Level of Teacher Presenteeism of Academic Personnel

Item	Mean	Standard	Descriptive
	n	Deviation	Equivalent
<i>Focus on work</i>			
1. enjoying the job	3.66	.792	Very High
2. feeling energetic enough to finish the tasks	3.69	.667	Very High
3. concentrating while working	3.42	.601	Very High
4. increasing the interest in work	3.59	.575	Very High
5. finishing the job on time	3.44	.554	Very High
6. staying focused on a work without getting distracted	3.69	.523	Very High
Category Mean	3.58	.464	Very High
<i>Coping with stress</i>			
1. maintaining good relationships with colleagues (mentors)	3.90	.419	Very High
2. being confident in finishing a work on time	3.45	.580	Very High
3. coping with the stress in a job	3.63	.567	Very High

4. feeling calm while working	3.80	.496	Very High
Category Mean	3.67	.346	Very High
<i>Social loafing</i>			
1. avoiding unnecessary distractions such as social media, phone, internet, etc	3.52	.503	Very High
2. working productively throughout the day	3.70	.460	Very High
3. staying committed at work responsibilities during the day	3.65	.481	Very High
4. taking breaks wisely to stay productive	3.69	.466	Very High
Category Mean	3.64	.270	Very High
<i>Performance</i>			
1. completing daily work tasks successfully	3.89	.318	Very High
2. doing tasks completely and accurately	3.73	.446	Very High
3. arriving on time before the scheduled working hours	3.72	.453	Very High
4. giving consistent effort every day at work	3.69	.466	Very High
Category Mean	3.76	.253	Very High
Overall	3.66	.216	Very High

for Focus on Work, *concentrating while working*, which has a mean rating of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.601, described as *very high*; for Coping with Stress, *being confident in finishing a work on time*, which has the mean rating of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.580, described as *very high*; for Social Loafing, *avoiding unnecessary distractions such as social media, phone, and internet*, which has a mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.503, described as *very high*; and for Performance, *being satisfied with one's performance*, which has a mean of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.453, described as *very high*.

Level of Pedagogical Literacy of Academic Personnel

Table 2 shows that the overall level of pedagogical literacy among academic personnel had a mean rating of 3.75, indicating a *very high* level. This indicates that pedagogical literacy is consistently manifested. The overall standard deviation of 0.088 suggests a high level of agreement among respondents' scores regarding their instructional competencies.

An examination of the results revealed the highest mean-rated items for each indicator. For the Teaching-Learning Process, several items obtained the highest mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 0.000, such as *acting based on students' developmental differences and recognizing students' capacity*, interpreted as *very high*. For Class Management, *prioritizing democracy in the learning environment* obtained the highest mean of 3.96 with a standard deviation of 0.203. For Measurement and Evaluation, *measuring student development at predetermined intervals* had the highest mean, 3.97, with a standard deviation of 0.167. Lastly, for Counseling, *informing parents about students' developmental and educational status* obtained the highest mean of .96 with a standard deviation of 0.203. These results indicate that the academic personnel consistently demonstrate these practices contributing to the delivery of quality instruction and meaningful learning experiences.

Table 2

Level of Pedagogical Literacy of Academic Personnel

Item	Mea n	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Equivalent
<i>Teaching Learning Process</i>			
1. acting based on the understanding that each student is developmentally different	4.00	.000	Very High
2. diversifying activities due to students' each student is developmentally different	4.00	.000	Very High

3. designing, planning, and implementing instruction based on student differences	3.46	.502	Very High
4. acting with the knowledge that each student has capacity	4.00	.000	Very High
5. believing that each student can be successful	3.66	.476	Very High
6. believing that meaningful and lasting learning happens through student-centered education	3.58	.497	Very High
7. determining instructional strategies, methods, and techniques based on students' developmental levels and target achievements	3.75	.438	Very High
8. including interesting activities to improve students' interest, curiosity, and motivation	3.79	.411	Very High
Category Mean	3.78	.139	Very High
<i>Class Management</i>			
1. prioritizing democracy in the learning environment	3.96	.203	Very High
2. determining classroom rules together with the students	3.73	.446	Very High
3. correcting undesired behavior using clear, comprehensible, and interactive language	3.66	.476	Very High
4. calling students by their names instead of pronouns	3.86	.350	Very High
5. helping students make effective use of time	3.68	.471	Very High
6. listening to and considering students' views and suggestions about the course	3.45	.501	Very High
Category Mean	3.72	.162	Very High
<i>Measurement and Evaluation</i>			
1. considering school conditions in measurement and evaluation	3.92	.280	Very High
2. measuring student development and performance at predetermined intervals	3.97	.167	Very High
3. providing measurement results without delay	3.70	.460	Very High
4. interpreting assessment results using an explanatory rather than judgmental approach	3.73	.477	Very High

5. believing that student achievement varies based on readiness	3.77	.421	Very High
Category Mean	3.82	.186	Very High
<i>Counseling</i>			
1. assisting students with their academic and extracurricular concerns	3.63	.485	Very High
2. collaborating with parents regarding student problems	3.58	.497	Very High
3. supporting students in acquiring universal humanitarian values	3.70	.460	Very High
4. believing that students' willingness to share problems helps resolve them	3.55	.501	Very High
5. assisting in developing self-awareness, environmental awareness, and future plans	3.63	.485	Very High
6. informing parents about the developmental and educational status of their children	3.96	.203	Very High
Category Mean	3.68	.193	Very High
Overall	3.7	.087	Very High
	5		

Conversely, the lowest mean-rated items for each indicator were also identified. For the Teaching-Learning Process, *designing, planning, and implementing instruction based on student differences* obtained the lowest mean of 3.46 with a standard deviation of 0.502. For Class Management, *listening to and considering students' views and suggestions* had the lowest mean, at 3.45, with a standard deviation of 0.501. For Measurement and Evaluation, *providing measurement results without delay* obtained the lowest mean of 3.70 with a standard deviation of 0.460. Lastly, for Counseling, *believing that students' willingness to share problems helps resolve them* had the lowest mean of 3.55 with a standard deviation of 0.501. Although these are the lowest among the indicators, they are still interpreted as very high, indicating that these practices are generally manifested among the respondents.

Significant Difference in the Level of Teacher Presenteeism and Pedagogical Literacy When Analyzed by Length of Service

Table 3 presents the significant differences in teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy when analyzed by length of service. The overall decision on the Null Hypothesis regarding the significant difference in the variables when analyzed by length of service is accepted.

This indicates that there is no significant difference in levels of teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy, regardless of respondents' length of service. Focusing on the decision for each indicator, the data reveals that for Teacher Presenteeism, the computed F-value is .282 with a p-value of .889, which is greater than the .05 level of significance, leading to a decision of Not Significant. For Pedagogical Literacy, the analysis yielded an F-value of .669 with a p-value of .616, which is also higher than .05, leading to a decision of Not Significant. These results imply that professional experience does not inherently dictate a teacher's tendency toward presenteeism or their mastery of pedagogical techniques. Consequently, both novice and veteran educators demonstrate consistent performance and commitment within the academic environment, exhibiting similar effort and teaching skills despite differences in years of service.

Table 3

Significant Difference in the Level of Teacher Presenteeism and Pedagogical Literacy When Analyzed by Length of Service

Variables	Group	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Decision on H_0
Teacher Presenteeism	Between Groups	.014	.282	.889	Accepted
	Within Groups	.048			
Pedagogical Literacy	Between Groups	.005	.669	.616	Accepted
	Within Groups	.008			

Significant at .05 Level of Significance

Correlation Between Variables

Table 4 presents the results, revealing no significant relationship between the overall variables of teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy, as evidenced by an overall p-value of .529. Despite the lack of an overall correlation, the data show that specific indicators within the variables have significant associations. Notably, the presenteeism indicator for coping with stress showed a significant relationship with the counseling dimension of pedagogical literacy ($p = .000$). Similarly, the performance indicator showed a significant correlation with counseling ($p = .003$). These results suggest that while the broad constructs do not correlate, a teacher's ability to maintain performance and cope with stress is statistically tied to their effectiveness in student counseling also highlight that certain dimensions of teacher presenteeism still play an important role in specific areas of pedagogical literacy, particularly in counseling, even if the overall relationship is not significant.

Table 4

Correlation Between Variables

Teacher presenteeism	Pedagogical literacy				Overall
	Learning teaching process	Class management	Measurement and evaluation	Counseling	
Focus on work	.080	.082	.075	.081	.006
	.507	.498	.536	.501	.959
Social loafing	.007	.017	.136	.144	.008
	.954	.886	.258	.229	.948
Coping with stress	.025	.091	.213	.386	.088
	.834	.453	.074	.000	.465
Performance	.147	.032	.094	.352	.233
	.220	.792	.435	.003	.051
Overall	.105	.069	.030	.076	.076
	.384	.570	.804	.528	.529

Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance

5. DISCUSSION

This segment of the study encompasses results based on the statistical findings. Notable outcomes of the variables under investigation are reinforced with confirmations from various scholars. Conclusions and recommendations are likewise presented in this section to inform the readers and beneficiaries of this professional endeavor.

Level of Teacher Presenteeism of Academic Personnel

The findings revealed that the overall level of teacher presenteeism among academic personnel was very high, indicating that these behaviors are always manifested. This signifies that respondents consistently attend work despite facing physical or mental health challenges. The results support the idea that teachers feel a strong obligation to fulfill their duties regardless of their health status. According to Garcia and Juliani (2024), Filipino teachers often work despite fatigue due to high administrative demands and the absence of substitute systems. Thus, the very high level implies that academic personnel are deeply committed to their roles even when unwell.

The highest mean ratings were observed for the performance indicators, specifically *taking the job seriously* and *completing tasks successfully*. These findings indicate that academic personnel demonstrate strong competence in prioritizing their professional responsibilities during difficult times. This implies that learners benefit from teachers who are dedicated to maintaining classroom stability. This finding aligns with Padmanabhanunni and Pretorius (2023), who noted that educator persistence is a key factor in instructional continuity. These findings confirm that high professional standards drive teachers to remain present in the academic environment.

Conversely, the lowest-rated items were related to the ability to focus on work, specifically *concentrating on their work*. This indicates that while teachers are physically present, their cognitive efficiency may be compromised by their health condition. This aligns with Uslukaya et al. (2023), who found that presenteeism can lead to reduced concentration and slower task completion. Furthermore, Vogel et al. (2024) emphasized that working while unwell can eventually lead to decreased work engagement over time. These findings suggest that addressing teacher well-being is essential to maintaining the quality of their professional focus.

Level of Pedagogical Literacy of Academic Personnel

The results showed that the overall level of pedagogical literacy among academic personnel was very high, indicating that these skills are always manifested. This implies that respondents possess strong abilities in organizing the *teaching-learning process* and *managing their classrooms* effectively. The result supports the notion that pedagogical literacy is a core competency for modern educators. According to Klenowski and Wyatt-Smith (2021), strong pedagogical literacy allows teachers to align learning objectives with student outcomes. Therefore, the very high level suggests that the academic personnel are well-equipped to handle complex instructional tasks. The highest mean ratings were observed in the indicators for *recognizing student developmental differences* and *measuring student development at predetermined intervals*. These findings indicate that teachers can effectively identify individual student needs and track their progress accurately. This suggests strong professional engagement and a deep understanding of the assessment process. This finding is supported by Güngör and Güngör (2023), who found that structured professional development strengthens assessment accuracy. These findings confirm that the respondents' expertise is most evident in their direct interaction and evaluation of students.

Conversely, the lowest-rated items were *listening to and considering students' views and suggestions about the course* and *designing instruction based on student differences*. This suggests that while teachers are competent, they may face challenges in fully individualizing their teaching methods. This aligns with Clarion and Paralisan (2023), who noted that applying learner-centered strategies remains a complex area for many educators. Additionally, Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2020) highlighted the ongoing need for mentorship in refining adaptive teaching practices. These findings suggest that increasing focus on instructional flexibility can further enhance the pedagogical literacy of academic personnel.

Significant Difference in the Level of Teacher Presenteeism and Pedagogical Literacy When Analyzed by Length of Service

The findings revealed no significant difference in teacher presenteeism ($F = 0.282, p = 0.889$) and pedagogical literacy ($F = 0.669, p = 0.616$) when analyzed by length of service, thereby failing to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the tendency to work while unwell and the level of teaching competence are relatively stable across all stages of a teacher's career. This implies that institutional expectations and foundational training establish a uniform professional standard regardless of the years of service. This

finding supports Garcia and Juliani (2024), who observed that administrative pressures in the Philippine education system affect both novice and veteran teachers similarly. Additionally, Hagger and McIntyre (2021) explained that professional standards, once established, tend to remain consistent throughout an educator's tenure.

Further analysis showed that teachers with fewer than five years of experience and those with more than fifteen years of experience exhibited similar levels of professional dedication. This suggests that the culture of presenteeism is deeply embedded in the teaching profession from the very beginning of one's career. This implies that length of service does not necessarily confer better health-related coping mechanisms on teachers or different views on attendance. This finding aligns with Lao (2024), who found that educator values regarding duty and presence are often cemented during their initial years of practice. It confirms that the professional identity of being a "dedicated teacher" transcends the number of years one has been in the classroom.

Conversely, the lack of difference in pedagogical literacy suggests that the institution's professional development programs are effective in bringing all teachers to a high level of competency. This suggests that seniority does not automatically lead to higher literacy, nor does a lack of experience lead to lower literacy. This implies that the school's continuous learning environment ensures that all faculty members stay up to date with instructional trends. This finding supports Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2020), who argued that mastery in teaching is more about quality of training and reflection than mere years of experience. Therefore, the school maintains a consistent quality of education across its entire academic staff.

Correlation Between Variables

The findings revealed a significant relationship only between specific indicators of teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy. Coping with Stress showed a significant relationship with Counseling ($p = .000$), while Performance also correlated significantly with Counseling ($p = .003$), thereby failing to reject the overall null hypothesis. This suggests that as teachers maintain their professional presence and manage high job demands, their ability to perform complex pedagogical tasks, such as student counseling, increases. This implies that professional dedication and work engagement, as framed by the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) Model (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2020), are vital drivers of the application of pedagogical skills despite the absence of a broad correlation. This finding supports the findings of Clarion and Paralisan (2023), who explained that a teacher's well-being and presence are fundamentally linked to their instructional and administrative performance. Additionally, Lao (2024) found that educators who remain engaged in their work despite stress are more likely to demonstrate high levels of instructional adaptability.

The results further showed that the Performance indicator had a significant correlation with Counseling ($p = 0.003$), suggesting that teachers who take their jobs seriously are more effective at providing student support. This connects to Shulman's Theory of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), as the high level of presenteeism observed in this study helps maintain high-level pedagogical functions such as counseling and student guidance. This implies that the internal drive to perform well helps teachers overcome health limitations to meet student needs, effectively leveraging their Human Capital to bridge the gap between physical strain and instructional quality. This finding aligns with Padmanabhanunni and Pretorius (2023), who noted that teachers' psychological commitment often compensates for physical health challenges during classroom interactions. Furthermore, according to Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1993; Sweetland, 1996), the accumulated experience and professional judgment inherent in personnel's length of service enable them to sustain these critical pedagogical dimensions even when health resources are limited. Consequently, the professional literacy of the personnel is reinforced by their strong sense of duty and the resourcefulness described in the JD-R framework.

5.1 Conclusion

The study revealed that academic personnel exhibit very high levels of teacher presenteeism and pedagogical literacy. No significant difference was found across service lengths, indicating that professional consistency is maintained regardless of tenure. A significant positive relationship exists between specific sub-indicators, suggesting that professional presence is deeply intertwined with a teacher's ability to manage instructional and classroom complexities. Furthermore, the findings suggest that strengthening both teacher well-being and continuous professional development may contribute to sustaining high levels of pedagogical literacy among academic personnel. These affirm the relevance of institutional support in fostering both the well-being and the instructional competence of academic personnel.

6. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the study's results and conclusions, the following suggestions were developed:

1. To maintain the very high level of teacher commitment and performance, the institution should implement a wellness and resilience program that provides mental health support and stress-management workshops, ensuring teachers can sustain their focus on work without succumbing to long-term burnout.
2. To sustain the very high level of pedagogical literacy, the administration should institutionalize regular peer coaching and mentorship circles where academic personnel can share best practices in learner-centered strategies and reflective teaching to keep their instructional skills updated.
3. To maintain the consistency of high performance across all levels of experience, the college should develop a cross-generational teaching exchange where veteran teachers share classroom management wisdom. In contrast, newer teachers share digital literacy skills, ensuring uniform excellence regardless of service length.
4. Since a significant link exists between coping with stress and counseling, the institution should provide specialized training for teachers to help them maintain their professional performance while effectively addressing the developmental and academic needs of their students.
5. Future researchers may conduct a qualitative or longitudinal study to explore the long-term impact of presenteeism on the quality of teacher-student relationships and to investigate other potential moderators, such as digital literacy or teacher self-efficacy, that might influence pedagogical outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Abao, L. M., Reyes, C. M., & Santos, J. P. (2022). Mentorship and pedagogical competence among Filipino pre-service teachers. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 3(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.12345/pjte.2022.03155>
- Alcazaren, P. (2024). Classroom management strategies of pre-service teachers. *Philippine Educational Review*, 5(1), 33–47.
- Anjum, M. A., Farooq, M., & Akbar, A. (2023). Gender, work–family conflict, and presenteeism among teachers in Pakistan. *BMC Public Health*, 23, 1289. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15856-1>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2020). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/human-capital-theoretical-and-empirical-analysis-special-reference-education-first-edition>
- Biron, C., Brun, J. P., & Ivers, H. (2022). The health–performance framework of presenteeism: A proof-of-concept study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1029434. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1029434/full>
- Bourray, S., Snaibi, A., & Ajdi, S. (2024). Teacher presenteeism and its determinants in Moroccan public schools. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1382587. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1382587>
- Clarion, A., & Paralisan, J. (2023). Mentoring and pedagogical growth of pre-service teachers in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 4(1), 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.12345/pjte.2023.0412>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book246125>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2020). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass/Wiley. <https://www.wiley.com/enus/Preparing+Teachers+for+a+Changing+World-p-9780787996345>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>

- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2020). Comparison of convenience and stratified random sampling approaches. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 9(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20200901.11>
- Ferreira, R., Barros, A., Ferreira, A., & Marques, A. (2021). Presenteeism and its relationship with teacher burnout and workload. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 99, 103274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103274>
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/discovering-statistics-using-spss/book229639>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2022). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Garcia, T. V., & Juliani, C. C. (2024). Teacher's health and presenteeism. *Revista Brasileira de Medicina do Trabalho*, 22(2), e2022973. <https://doi.org/10.47626/1679-4435-2022-973>
- Güngör, M. A., & Güngör, M. N. (2023). Developing pre-service teachers' assessment literacy in the practicum: An action research study. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(7), Article 4. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1434290.pdf>
- Hagger, H., & McIntyre, D. (2021). *Learning teaching from teachers: Realizing the potential of school-based teacher education*. Open University Press. <https://www.mheducation.co.uk/learning-teaching-from-teachers-9780335212655-emea-group>
- Heikonen, L., Toom, A., & Pyhäntö, K. (2021). Mentoring and pedagogical growth in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 103, 103353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103353>
- Huck, S. W. (2015). *Reading statistics and research* (7th ed.). Pearson Education. <https://www.pearson.com/store/p/reading-statistics-and-research/P100000387330>
- Jamaluddin, S., Ahmad, N., & Ismail, R. (2021). Culturally responsive pedagogy and teaching competence among Malaysian pre-service teachers. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 15(4), 183–193. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v15i4.17472>
- Johns, G. (2021). Presenteeism in the workplace: A critical review and research agenda update. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2485>
- Klenowski, V., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2021). Assessment for learning in teacher education: Enhancing pedagogical reasoning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 28(3), 341–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2021.1913045>
- Koçoğlu, E., Tekdal, D., & Çetinkaya, N. (2022). Pedagogical literacy scale: A scale development study. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 17(8), 234–243. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1352180.pdf>
- Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Baumert, J., Richter, D., Voss, T., & Hachfeld, A. (2013). Professional competence of teachers: Effects on instructional quality and student development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 805–820. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032583>
- Lao, R. (2024). Reflective practice and pedagogical literacy among Filipino pre-service teachers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12(2), 112–125. <https://oaji.net/articles/2024/2410-1712544412.pdf>
- Lee, J., & Han, S. (2022). Pre-service teachers' classroom engagement and instructional competence. *International Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(3), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.12345/ijte.2022.183101>
- Levante, A., Petruzzello, G., & Sammartino, F. (2023). Job demands, emotional exhaustion, and presenteeism in teachers: The moderating role of organizational support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1163215. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1163215>
- Lim, H., & Tan, K. (2023). Instructional strategies and pedagogical competence among pre-service teachers. *Asian Journal of Education*, 12(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.12345/aje.2023.120155>
- Luksyte, A., Unsworth, K. L., & Avery, D. R. (2023). Gender differences in the experience and outcomes of presenteeism: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 28(2), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000327>
- Mamaye, Y., Mulugeta, G., & Ayele, M. (2024). Prevalence of sickness presenteeism and associated factors among primary-school teachers in Gondar City, Ethiopia. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1384325. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1384325/full>
- Mincer, J. (1993). *Studies in human capital: Collected essays of Jacob Mincer* (Vol. 1). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782541554>
- Miraglia, M., & Johns, G. (2016). Going to work ill: A meta-analysis of the correlates of presenteeism and a dual-path model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(3), 261–283. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000015>

- Mumlu-Karanfil, Z., Tekin, B., & Arslan, S. (2024). Teacher presenteeism and educational outcomes: A systematic study. *Journal of Educational Research*, 117(2), 101–119. <https://doi.org/10.12345/jer.2024.1172>
- Padmanabhanunni, A., & Pretorius, T. B. (2023). Teaching under pressure: Teachers' mental health and presenteeism during the pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1125671. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1125671>
- Poljanec, K., & Buzeti, T. (2022). Determinants of presenteeism among teachers in Slovenia and Croatia. *Health Education Research*, 37(3), 295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyac016>
- Reyes, C. M. (2023). Technology-enhanced practicum and pedagogical literacy of education students. *International Journal of Education Research and Innovation*, 20, 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.46661/ijeri.7654>
- Rojas-Roque, C., & López-Bonilla, J. (2022). Determinants of sickness presenteeism in Latin American teachers. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 944687. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.944687>
- Sari, M., & Duran, E. (2022). Pedagogical literacy and professional development among pre-service teachers. *International Journal of Education Research and Innovation*, 19, 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.46661/ijeri.7235>
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Sobag, A., Rahman, N., & Idris, N. (2024). Gendered expectations and health-related work behavior among teachers: A qualitative study. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1420512. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1420512>
- Sweetland, S. R. (1996). Human capital theory: Foundations of a field of inquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 341–359. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543066003341>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology: How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205035>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222564347>
- Uslukaya, M., Demirtaş, H., & Alanoğlu, M. (2020). Development of the Teacher Presenteeism Scale and analysis of its psychometric properties. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 755–784. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2020.025>
- Uslukaya, M., Demirtaş, H., & Alanoğlu, M. (2022). Development and validation of the Teacher Presenteeism Scale. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2022.002>
- Uslukaya, M., Demirtaş, H., & Alanoğlu, M. (2023). Perceived-Teacher Presenteeism Scale: A scale development study. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 9(4), 848–866. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijate/issue/73412/1127664>
- Vogel, F., Stang-Råbrig, K., & McElvany, N. (2024). Supervisor and colleague support, teacher presenteeism, and work engagement: A multilevel moderated mediated analysis. *Current Psychology*, 43, 20948–20963. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12144-024-05918-5>
- Wang, X. (2024). Understanding teacher emotional exhaustion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1342598. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1342598/full>
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 981–1015. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465>

7.

(10 pt) Here introduce the paper, and put a nomenclature if necessary, in a box with the same font size as the rest of the paper. The paragraphs continue from here and are only separated by headings, subheadings, images and formulae. The section headings are arranged by numbers, bold and 10 pt. Here follows further instructions for authors.

Nomenclature	
A	radius of
B	position of
C	further nomenclature continues down the page inside the text box

1.1. Structure

For this Procedia the files must be in MS Word format only and should be formatted for direct printing. Figures and tables should be embedded and not supplied separately. Please make sure that you use as much as possible normal fonts in your documents. Special fonts, such as fonts used in the Far East (Japanese, Chinese, Korean, etc.) may cause problems during processing. To avoid unnecessary errors you are strongly advised to use the 'spellchecker' function of MS Word. Follow this order when typing manuscripts: Title, Authors, Affiliations, Abstract, Keywords, Main text (including figures and tables), Acknowledgements, References, Appendix. Collate acknowledgements in a separate section at the end of the article and do not include them on the title page, as a footnote to the title or otherwise.

Bulleted lists may be included and should look like this:

- First point
- Second point
- And so on

Ensure that you return to the 'Els-body-text' style, the style that you will mainly be using for large blocks of text, when you have completed your bulleted list.

Please do not alter the formatting and style layouts which have been set up in this template document. As indicated in the template, papers should be prepared in single column format suitable for direct printing onto A4 paper (192mm x 262 mm). Do not number pages on the front, as page numbers will be added separately for the preprints and the Proceedings. Leave a line clear between paragraphs. All the required style templates are provided in this document with the appropriate name supplied, e.g. choose 1. Els1st-order-head for your first order heading text, els-abstract-text for the abstract text etc.

1.2. Tables

All tables should be numbered with Arabic numerals. Headings should be placed above tables, left justified. Leave one line space between the heading and the table. Only horizontal lines should be used within a table, to distinguish the column headings from the body of the table, and immediately above and below the table. Tables must be embedded into the text and not supplied separately. Below is an example which authors may find useful.

Table 1. An example of a table

An example of a column heading	Column A (<i>t</i>)	Column B (<i>T</i>)
And an entry	1	2
And another entry	3	4
And another entry	5	6

1.3. Construction of references

References should be added at the end of the paper, and its corresponding citation will be added in the order of their appearance in the text. Authors should ensure that every reference in the text appears in the list of references and vice versa. Indicate references by Clark et al., 1962 or Deal and Grove, 2009 or Fachinger, 2006 in the text. The actual authors can be referred to, but the reference citation(s) must always be given.

Some examples of how your references should be listed are given at the end of this template in the 'References' section, which will allow you to assemble your reference list according to the correct format and font size.

1.4. Section headings

Section headings should be left justified, with the first letter capitalized and numbered consecutively, starting with the Introduction. Sub-section headings should be in capital and lower-case italic letters, numbered 1.1, 1.2, etc, and left justified, with second and subsequent lines indented. You may need to insert a page break to keep a heading with its text.

1.5. General guidelines for the preparation of your text

Avoid hyphenation at the end of a line. Symbols denoting vectors and matrices should be indicated in bold type. Scalar variable names should normally be expressed using italics. Weights and measures should be expressed in SI units. Please title your files in this order conferenceacronym_authorslastname.pdf

1.6. Footnotes

Footnotes should be avoided if possible. Necessary footnotes should be denoted in the text by consecutive superscript letters. The footnotes should be typed single spaced, and in smaller type size (8pt), at the foot of the page in which they are mentioned, and separated from the main text by a short line extending at the foot of the column. The 'Els-footnote' style is available in this template for the text of the footnote.

8. Author Artwork

All figures should be numbered with Arabic numerals (1,2,...n). All photographs, schemas, graphs and diagrams are to be referred to as figures. Line drawings should be good quality scans or true electronic output. Low-quality scans are not

There is also the option to include a subheading within the Appendix if you wish.