check for updates

Impact of multitasking on teachers' performance in public elementary schools

 Joseph Pepito[1]
 Venus Pepito[2]
 Roberto Suson[3+]

[1]*Cebu Technological University, College of Technology, Main Campus, Cebu City Philippines.*
Email: joseph.pepito@gmail.com
[2]*Department of Education Cebu Province, Cebu City Philippines.*
Email: venuspepito@gmail.com
[3]*Cebu Technological University, College of Education, Main Campus, Cebu City Philippines.*
Email: robertosuson29@gmail.com

(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Multitasking has become a prevalent strategy for handling a multitude of tasks, though its efficacy remains a topic of debate in the domain of organizational behavior. In the context of education, teachers perpetually grapple with an extensive array of daily responsibilities. This study was undertaken with the objective of evaluating the impact of teachers' multitasking on the overall quality of performance within identified public elementary schools. In this research quantitative method was employed, involving school leaders and teachers from three specific schools, and a multifaceted approach was employed. The sampling strategy included purposeful sampling to select school's representative of the population, employing stratified sampling for diversity, and ensuring randomness where needed. The study culminated in an integration of both data types, yielding a comprehensive understanding of the research questions. Ethical considerations, informed consent, and confidentiality were maintained throughout the research process, ensuring the validity and reliability of the findings. The study's findings reveal that public-school teachers are heavily burdened with multitasking responsibilities, negatively affecting their teaching performance and leading to subpar academic outcomes. To address this issue, the researcher strongly recommends the implementation, rigorous assessment, and continuous monitoring of a training program. In essence, this study highlights the detrimental impact of multitasking on teaching performance in public elementary schools and emphasizes the urgent need for improvement through a structured training program aimed at enhancing the educational experience for teachers and students alike.

Contribution/Originality: This research provides a valuable contribution to education studies, examining how multitasking affects teaching quality in public elementary schools. This study is one of its kind to highlight the detrimental impact of multitasking on the performance of teachers in public elementary schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, multitasking has been seen as a positive trait, especially in the increasingly complex and demanding field of teaching (Martinez, Del Ser, Osaba, & Herrera, 2021). Various factors contribute to this trend, including societal changes, evolving job roles, and shifts in the moral and normative aspects of teaching (Björk, Browne-Ferrigno, & Potterton, 2020; Brante, 2009). Multitasking typically involves handling multiple tasks simultaneously, and it is seen as a valuable skill for teachers dealing with growing workloads (Bi, Xue, & Zhang,

2021; Laloyaux, Van der Linden, Nuechterlein, Thonon, & Larøi, 2018). Our brains are naturally wired for multitasking (Lesort et al., 2020). Duggan, Johnson, and Sørli (2013) and Laloyaux et al. (2018) suggest that people can strategically allocate their attention when faced with various activities to optimize performance (Purwanto et al., 2020). Stoneman (2007) emphasizes that multitasking involves performing more than one action simultaneously, which in the context of teaching can mean managing situations while also thinking about work-related matters (Hjálmsdóttir & Bjarnadóttir, 2021). The primary motivation for multitasking is often to reduce time pressure, allowing more leisure time and less time spent on basic tasks. However, Rubinstein, Meyer, and Evans (2001) point out that while people believe multitasking saves time, it can actually lead to time loss due to constant task-switching and the mental adjustments required (Fatema, Syeed, & Miah, 2020). Nevertheless, Stoneman (2007) notes that there is no all-encompassing theory of multitasking, making it a complex and evolving area of study.

According to Howard (2012) findings, teachers who multitask have a lower individual quotient and are less effective. As DeBerard, Spielmans, and Julka (2004) points out, multitasking is critical in today's world because it allows us to do more while doing less. However, teachers tend to overlook the importance of improving student mental talents while focusing on quantity over quality in the classroom (Dietrich, 2021). According to Brunce (2014), multitasking by instructors has bad consequences on the brain, yet it's unavoidable in today's demanding schedule, especially for teachers, so be sure to set limits and goals for yourself. While multitasking on academic work has been linked to poor performance, Baran (2013) emphasizes that multitasking behavior in education is also linked to social media. According to Tropall (2016), people are not like computers, which can perform several operations with all of the requisite concentration on each one, as stated by Nosko, Wood, and Molema (2010) that human beings cannot focus on more than one item at a time. The ability to focus on a single activity and delegate other inputs to lower levels of awareness is essential for success. According to Chun, Golomb, and Turk-Browne (2011), instructors who multitask must be given special attention and interventions because switching concentration from one job to another too rapidly can be harmful to students' education since it prevents teachers from giving their best effort because they are distracted. It was shown that people stopped switching on activities since they were no longer profitable (Pyne, Duggan, & Neth, 2007).

On the other hand, some research reveals that the human brain can be made to multitask. According to Hargittai (2007) study published in Child Development, the brain's ability to categorize conflicting information continues to grow as a person gets older (Alhebaishi, 2019). Another Vanderbilt University (2015) study indicated that the pace at which our prefrontal brain processes information limits our ability to multitask. According to Dux (2014), this process can be sped up with the right training. However, according to Bonilla (2015) research, even after prolonged training, the brain is still incapable of multitasking. Despite the brain being skilled at absorbing and responding to specific types of information, it still can't do both at the same time, according to this study (Myin & Van den Herik, 2021). It is well known that people have a limited capacity for knowledge retention, which deteriorates with increasing information overload. As a result, information is frequently rearranged to enhance recall. Short-term memory is believed by Junco and Cotten (2011) to be the limit of the human brain's ability to store large amounts of information. Several experiments in the lab show that switching between activities is motivated by the desire to spend more time on the one that pays off the most (Pyne et al., 2007). This reward might be a step closer to achieving a larger work objective, or it could be the chance to engage in a more engaging or enjoyable activity (Malone & Lepper, 2021). A person's decision to change tasks was driven by the reward that came with the current activity or by the availability of a better opportunity to achieve another objective (Fishbach & Woolley, 2022).

One type of multitasking, according to Junco, Merson, and Salter (2010), is done by skimming over the details of the job at hand. If you're always paying only a portion of your attention to something, you're multitasking. Teachers who are given more and more tasks will be able to multitask better since they will have access to more information at the same time. Despite these crucial insights from the literature, a holistic framework that would

describe teachers multitasking particularly in providing quality education is missing, and it serves as the main departure of this work.

Thus, this work bridges by offering an insight on the work profile, time spent on multitasking, administrative support activities and degree of multitasking role as to organizational behavior. The goal of education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and character that will allow people to be accountable, to be able to work, and participate in the well-being of society (Lavy, 2020; Wortham, Love-Jones, Peters, Morris, & García-Huidobro, 2020). Teacher, being the instrument, is regarded to play multi-roles (Kumar, 2020) as knowledge initiator (Mehdiyev, 2020), learning director (Ivrendi, 2020), scientific researcher (Foti, 2020), model to students (Haerazi, Irawan, Suadiyatno, & Hidayatullah, 2020), actors and actresses (Neumann & Herodotou, 2020), the best visual aids that can be regarded as a classroom manager (Kim, 2020). To explain the roles of teachers as multitaskers, will contribute significant insights for the school administrators to mitigate proper service that leads to quality education.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: section 2 discusses the literature. Section 3 discusses the methodology. Finally, section 4 provides a discussion of the insights from the results and the implications.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The existing literature on multitasking within educational systems is relatively sparse. Previous studies predominantly focused on its impact on educational performance (Alghamdi, Karpinski, Lepp, & Barkley, 2020; Alvarez-Risco et al., 2021; Luo, Yeung, & Li, 2020). One emerging research trend in this field examines how multitasking affects educational performance within learning environments (Alkahtani et al., 2016). While these studies offer valuable insights related to our current inquiry, it is crucial to emphasize their strengths. Russ and Crews (2014) conducted a survey of multitasking behaviors in organizations (Cameron, 2018). Their findings unveiled a startling productivity loss of 148 minutes per day, suggesting that up to 30% of an average workday is unproductive due to multitasking and associated interruptions. Interestingly, many respondents did little to address these interruptions. Furthermore, their research indicated a non-linear relationship between multitasking and effective performance (Crews & Russ, 2020). Lastly, it also provided evidence of a potential generational difference in multitasking effectiveness, with age showing a negative correlation with the time taken to refocus on a task after an interruption (Chen, Wang, Tao, Jiang, & Li, 2021).

Higton et al. (2017), in their teacher workload survey 2016 and reported February 2017, relate workload to multitasking since the workload of teachers was based on time spent on teaching and non-teaching. Workload includes time spent in either of the following namely, first; related works other than teaching like preparation of lesson plans, dialogues with colleagues, checking of pupils' work, pupil counseling, communication with parents or guardians (Viac & Fraser, 2020), and engaging extra-curricular activities; second; support management activities, like replaced temporary absent teacher, coached or mentored other teacher, linked with other people aside from parents, third; administrative activities like complying different reports, setting up classrooms/classroom evaluation, involvement in school policymaking and financial planning, analyses on pupils' performance and participation for staff development (Brady, 2020). Based on this study, 52% of the teachers stated that workload relates to multitasking was a severe problem, 41% stated that it was a severe problem, and the rest did not know it all. It further stated that the hours spent on non-teaching tasks were massive, which had an average of 33.2 hours, and half of this time was spent on two activities, individual planning or preparation of lessons of school or out-of-the school, and the other marking of the pupils' work (Volman & Mc Callum, 2020). Furthermore, they are told that they spent too long also on administrative work, such as complying with different reports. With these issues on multitasking, Schieman and Young (2015) studies revealed that one of the people who engaged in multitasking was the individuals with higher education and income, the professionals in which teachers were one of them. Thus, one of the determinants of multitasking was the job-related demands (Mauno, Kubicek, Feldt, & Minkkinen, 2020). In

other words, teachers were the key learning individual who was still on its process, embracing education towards 21st-century students, which twined with different tasks, the multitasks.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employed the descriptive research methods type of research utilizing the quantitative – qualitative technique of gathering data from DepEd's teachers, in the province of Consolacion, City Cebu wherein their multitasking roles and their quality performance were identified and studied. The quantitative method was used with the aid of survey questionnaires, school's mean percentage score, and teachers' rating or the Result-Based Performance Management System. The process of descriptive-correlational research goes beyond mere gathering and tabulating data. According to Beauvais, Stewart, DeNisco, and Beauvais (2014) it involved the element of interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is described. Thus, the description was often combined with comparison and contrast involving measurements, classifications, interpretations, and evaluation. This method further may provide an end view to propose an amplifies training that would look at teachers' welfares and benefits to ensure better outcomes on pupils' learning.

3.2. Research setting and Sample

The research setting of the study comprised 15 public elementary schools including the integrated school and four (4) public high schools. A total of 19 public elementary and secondary schools catered the educational needs of the learners in Compostela District. The schools are categorized according to the number of their teachers. It is considered Primary if it consists of nine teachers and below. Medium schools consist of 10-29 teachers. High schools consist of 30-50 teachers. Lastly, Mega schools have 51 teachers and above. The respondents of this research were the public elementary school teachers of the identified public elementary schools in the Division of Cebu Province, specifically in the District of Compostela. There were four (4) elementary Schools in Compostela District represented by twenty percent of the total population of teachers. These respondents were chosen using a universal sampling method.

3.3. Instruments and Data gathering Procedure

This study used two sets of a questionnaire for data collection described as follows. The first set of the questionnaire was used to gather the personal details of the respondents and their perceptions of multi-tasking roles and the second set was the main questionnaire of the study which address the multitasking roles. This questionnaire contained three parts. The first part of the questionnaire gathered the profile of the respondents, which included the respondents' age and gender, highest educational attainment, civil status, teaching position/designation, length of service, latest RPMS rating, and the relevant training and seminars attended. The second part of the questionnaire gathered respondents' perceptions of multi-tasking role as to Time Management. This instrument was adopted from Teacher Workload Survey 2016 of Higton et al. (2017). and modified for this study. It was used to ask teachers to provide estimated working hours and the time spent on individual professional tasks for their most recent school year. It concerned about the relationship between the average time spent on the related works other than teaching; second, the relationship between the average times spent on administrative support activities, and lastly about the relationship between the money spent to complete other than teaching activities not mentioned. To facilitate data collection, this part was divided into two sections, namely the Related Works Other than Teaching, and the Administrative Support Activities. The respondents were advised to check the appropriate time allotted to each indicator.

The third part of the first set of questionnaires gathered the respondents' perceptions as to Organizational Behavior, and the Quality of Teaching. In this part, the participants were instructed to assess various items using a

4-point Likert scale, where 4 points indicated "Strongly Agree," 3 points represented "Agree," 2 points signified "Disagree," and 1 point denoted "Strongly Disagree." To gauge participants' perceptions and behaviors related to multitasking in their work, we adopted and modified the Organizational Behavior instrument from Russ and Crews (2014). This instrument was utilized to evaluate how individuals manage multitasking, their views on the benefits of multitasking, their ability to maintain productivity and efficiency while multitasking, their perception of organizational support, and their expectations regarding multitasking. Additionally, it aimed to assess the extent to which individuals bring their work-related tasks and personal matters into their work environment. Furthermore, we adapted and modified the Multi-tasking Role instrument, originally developed by Etuk, Afangideh, and Uya (2013) to measure the impact of multitasking on the quality of instruction in the context of teaching. This instrument was employed to inquire about teachers' effectiveness and efficiency in delivering instruction to their students while multitasking. It specifically examined their knowledge of the subject matter, communication skills, teaching methods employed, and classroom management abilities.

4. RESULTS

Table 1. Respondents profile.

Work profile of the respondents	Teachers (N=40)		School leaders (N= 5)		Overall (N=45)	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
A. Position						
Teacher 1	18	45.00	-	-	18	40.00
Teacher 2	3	7.50	-	-	3	6.67
Teacher 3	18	45.00	-	-	18	40.00
Master teacher 1			1	20.00	1	2.22
Master teacher 2	1	2.50			1	2.22
School head			4	80.00	4	8.89
B. Length of service						
Less than a year	2	5.00	-	-	2	4.44
1-5	8	20.00	-	-	8	17.78
6-10	16	40.00	-	-	16	35.56
11-15	4	10.00	1	20.00	5	11.11
16-20	3	7.50	1	20.00	4	8.89
21-25	6	15.00	2	40.00	8	17.78
26-30	1	2.50	1	20.00	2	4.44
C. Mean percentage score						
82.00	21	52.50				
84.10	10	25.00				
87.04	2	5.00				
90.24	7	17.50				
D. Performance						
Outstanding	8	20.00				
Very satisfactory	30	75.00				
Satisfactory	2	5.00				
E. Number of designations						
1	5	12.50				
2	12	30.00				
3	8	20.00				
4	6	15.00				
5	5	12.50				
6	4	10.00				

Table 1 presents respondents' profile comprising their position, length of service, mean percentage score and the school performance where the respondents were employed. The table shows that 21 or 52.50 percent have a Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of 82.00, ten or 25.00 percent have 84.10, two or 5 percent have 87.04 MPS, and

seven or 17.50 percent have the highest MPS of 90.24. Respondent's performance was categorized accordingly. There were 30 respondents or 75 percent having Very Satisfactory performance, eight (8) respondents or 20 percent having Outstanding performance, and two (2) respondents or five (5) percent having Satisfactory performance. The last profile being determined was the number of designations or ancillaries (workload aside from the regular teaching load) of the respondents in school. The Table also shows that 12 respondents or 30.00 percent have two additional designations aside from the regular teaching load. Eight respondents or 20 percent have three more designations, six respondents or 15 percent have four more additional designations, five respondents or 12.50 percent have five designations, and four respondents or 10 percent have six designations. This means that the respondents have adequate understanding in assessing their multitasking roles, considering that most of them were Teacher 3. It also means that the respondents were most likely experienced teachers since most of them have 10 to 15 years of teaching experience. The overall performance of the schools where the respondents were employed were above the performance level of 75 percent, and most of the respondents have Very Satisfactory performance.

Table 2. Time spent on multitasking.

Indicators	1-2 hours	3-4 hours	4-5 hours	6-7 hours	More than 8 hours
The average time you spend on multitasking in a day	2	16	11	5	6
After an interruption, how long to refocus in minutes.	23	5	4	6	2
Individual planning or preparations of lessons either at school or out of school	13	19	6	1	1
Teamwork and dialogue with colleagues within this school.	24	12	1	0	2
Marking or correcting pupils' work.	33	6	1	0	0
Pupil counseling (Including attending legal steps for pupils' who misbehaved)	33	6	1	0	0
Communication and Cooperation with parents or guardians.	27	12	1	0	0
Engaging extracurricular activities such as different monthly activities. Nutrition month, Buwan ng Wika, etc.	16	15	6	3	0
Pupil supervision, including lunch supervision and recess supervision.	25	8	1	5	1
Linkages are done such as barangay system.	18	11	5	6	0

Table 2 has listed some of the fundamental indicators when time spent for multitasking role for related works other than teaching is considered. First of which was "the average time you spend on multitasking in a day," two (2) respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 16 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; 11 respondents spent 4 to 5 hours; five respondents spent 6 to 7 hours, and six respondents spent more than 8 hours. The next indicator "after an interruption, how long to refocus in minutes" shows twenty-three respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; five respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; four respondents spent 4 to 5 hours; six respondents spent 6 to 7 hours, and two respondents spent more than 8 hours. Another indicator the "individual planning or preparations of lessons either at school or out of school" shows thirteen respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 19 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; six spent 4-5 hours; one respondent spent 6 to 7 hours and one respondent spent more than 8 hours. As to "teamwork and dialogue with colleagues within the school," shows 24 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 12 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; one respondent spent 4 to 5 hours, but no respondent spent 6 to 7 hours. Lastly, two respondents spent more than 8 hours. In the indicator "marking or correcting pupils' work" and "pupil counseling (including attending legal steps for pupils' who misbehaved)", 33 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; six respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; one spent 4-5 hours "Communication and cooperation with parents or guardians" 27 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 12 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; one respondent spent 4 to 5 hours, but no one spent six hours and more. In the indicator "engaging extracurricular activities such as different monthly activities like Nutrition Month, Buwan ng

Wika, etc." sixteen respondents spent 1-2 hours; 15 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; six respondents spent 4 to 5 hours; three respondents spent 6 to 7 hours, but no one spent more than 8 hours. "Pupil supervision including lunch supervision and recess supervision" shows twenty-five respondents spent 1-2 hours; eight respondents spent 3-4 hours; one spent 4-5 hours and more than 8 hours while five (5) respondents spent 6-7 hours. As to "linkages are done such as purok system," 18 respondents spent 1-2 hours; 11 respondents spent 3-4 hours; five (5) spent 4-5 hours; six (6) respondents spent 6-7, but no one spent six (6) hours and more.

This indicates that teachers have one of the essential jobs in the world. To put it another way, they play the roles of a parent, a disciplinarian, a manager, a mentor, and more, all at once. Teachers' multitasking is second nature to them; they get so much done that it's no surprise. Teachers and students both suffer when they attempt to multitask. They must also evaluate the progress of each student while teaching, know how much of a topic to cover, alter presentation methods or interact with the audience to keep them interested, and then move on to administrative chores such as writing reports, analytics, and so on. Each job a teacher undertakes detracts little from their total productivity and level of work quality.

Table 3. Administrative support activities.

Indicators	1-2 hours	3-4 hours	4-5 hours	6-7 hours	More than 8 hours
Replace the absent employee temporarily.	17	13	7	3	0
Appraise, monitor, coach, and mentor another teacher.	30	8	2	0	0
Contact with people outside school other than parents.	26	11	2	0	0
Comply with different monthly reports (Including different school forms and other required reports)	11	15	5	6	3
Organizing resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/ tidying classrooms	11	18	8	0	3
Involvement in school policy development.	16	17	4	3	0
Involvement in school financial planning.	20	14	4	1	0
Recording and analyzing data about pupil performance and other purposes.	12	19	1	5	3
Planning for intervention on pupils' assessment results.	17	16	4	3	0
Participation in staff development (Includes attending meetings).	22	12	3	1	1

Table 3 shows ten indicators when time spent for multitasking role for administrative support is considered. It started with "replace the absent employee temporarily," showing 17 respondents spent 1-2 hours; 13 respondents spent 3-4 hours; seven spent 4-5 hours; three respondents spent 6-7 hours, but no respondents spent more than 8 hours. "Appraise, monitor, coach, and mentor another teacher," showing thirty respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; eight (8) respondents spent 3-4 hours; 2 spent 4-5 hours, but none of the respondents spent six hours and more. In indicator "contact with people outside school other than parents," twenty-six respondents spent 1-2 hours; 11 respondents spent 3-4 hours; two spent 4-5 hours, but no respondents spent more than 8 hours. "Comply with different monthly reports (including different school forms and other required reports)," shows eleven respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 15 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; five spent 4-5 hours; six respondents spent 6-7 hours, and three respondents spent more than 8 hours. "Organizing resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/ tidying classrooms," 11 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 18 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; eight spent 4 to 5 hours; none of the respondents spent 6-7 hours. While three respondents spent more than 8 hours. In the indicator "involvement in school policy development," 16 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 17 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; four spent 4 to 5 hours; three respondents spent 6 to 7 hours, but none of the respondents spent more than 8 hours. "Involvement in school financial planning", 20 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 14 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; four spent 4 to 5 hours; one respondent spent 6 to 7 hours, but none of the respondents spent more than. Recording and analyzing data about pupil performance and other purposes shows 12 respondents spent 1 to 2 hours; 19 respondents spent 3-4 hours; only one respondent spent 4 to 5 hours; five respondents spent 6 to 7 hours, and three

respondents spent more than 8 hours. For the indicator "planning for intervention on pupils' assessment results," 17 respondents spent 1-2 hours; 16 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; four respondents spent 4-5 hours; three respondents spent 6 to 7 hours, but no one spent more than 8 hours. Last indicator, "participation in staff development (includes attending meetings)" shows 22 respondents spent 1-2 hours; 12 respondents spent 3 to 4 hours; three spent 4 to 5 hours, and one respondent spent 6 to 7 hours and more than 8 hours. This implies that administration supports are core functions of teachers to the efficient operation of the school. Office administrative jobs are one of the most commonly listed jobs of teachers in addition to their teaching functions.

Table 4. Degree of multitasking role as to organizational behavior.

Indicators	Teachers (N = 40)		School leaders (N = 5)		Overall (N = 45)	
	F	Response	F	Response	F	Response
Multitasking leads to improved productivity	2.55	A	2.80	A	2.58	A
Multitasking leads to improved efficiency	2.43	D	3.00	A	2.49	D
Ability to multitask considered a job requirement	2.85	A	2.80	A	2.84	A
Ability to multitask should be a job requirement	2.70	A	2.80	A	2.71	A
Make more errors when I multitask	2.63	A	2.60	A	2.62	A
It is distracting when someone is required to submit "ASAP" report in a multitask situation	3.15	A	2.80	A	3.11	A
It is distracting when someone is given a task, not on the field of specialization	3.10	A	2.80	A	3.07	A
It is distracting when someone multitasks during academic hours.	3.18	A	3.00	A	3.16	A
Can concentrate better, working more on one task at a time.	3.45	SA	3.00	A	3.40	SA
Can concentrate better, working more than one task at a time.	2.53	A	2.60	A	2.53	A
Often used evenings to catch up on work.	2.83	A	3.00	A	2.84	A
Often used weekends to catch-up on work.	2.83	A	3.20	A	2.87	A
Often used my teaching hours to catch-up on work.	2.98	A	2.80	A	2.96	A
Often used my recess time and lunch break to catch up on work.	3.05	A	3.40	SA	3.09	A
Often used my ancillary period to catch-up on work.	3.05	A	3.20	A	3.07	A
Often used my remedial period to catch-up on work.	2.90	A	3.00	A	2.91	A
Often used my preparatory period to catch-up on work	2.63	A	3.20	A	2.69	A
Ancillaries / Coordinatorship persist in me to multitask.	3.10	A	3.60	SA	3.16	A
The organization provides training to multitask effectively.	2.83	A	2.80	A	2.82	A
Typically, can respond to work in multitasking.	2.70	A	3.00	A	2.73	A

Note: A=Agree; SA: Strongly agree; D= Disagree.

Table 4 shows that out of the 20 indicators presented, the first indicator "I can concentrate better, working more on one task at a time was the only one rated Strongly Agree of 3.40 while indicator "multitasking leads to improved efficiency was rated Disagree at 2.49. The rest of the indicators "multitasking leads to improved productivity" 2.58, "ability to multitask considered a job requirement" 2.84, "ability to multitask should be a job requirement" 2.71, "make more errors when I multitask" 2.62, "it is distracting when someone is required to submit "ASAP" report in a multitask situation" 3.11, "it is distracting when someone is given a task, not on the field of specialization" 3.07, "it is distracting when someone multitasks during academic hours" 3.16, "often used evenings to catch up on work" 2.84, "often used weekends to catch-up on work" 2.87, "often used my teaching hours to catch-up on work" 2.96, "often used my recess time and lunch break to catch up on work" 3.09, "often used my ancillary

period to catch-up on work" 3.07, "often used my remedial period to catch-up on work" 2.91, "often used my preparatory period to catch-up on work" 2.69, "ancillaries/coordinator ship persist in me to multitask" 3.16, "the organization provides training to multitask effectively" 2.82, "can respond to work in multitasking" 2.73 were rated Agree.

Thus, it resulted in an overall average mean of 2.88, which is Average. This implies that a variety of changes in the present educational system strongly influences the role of a teacher. In this situation, teachers have to deal with new roles and new approaches to organizational culture in educational settings. Teachers should educate students in terms of organizational culture, which deals with the future generation problems. Furthermore, teachers' pay particular attention to the main feature of the organizational culture and its role in the educational process. However, the characteristics of the teacher are significant and require much responsibility. Teachers do more than just impart knowledge in the classroom; they also act as agents of change, ensuring that students have access to the resources they need to succeed. Small groups of students or one-on-one with students are the norm for teachers in the classroom and after school hours. Teachers also serve as assessors, making suggestions for improvement and issuing grades based on ongoing evaluations of students' skills, both formally and informally.

Table 5. Respondents' degree of multitasking role as to quality of teaching.

Indicators	Teachers (N = 40)		School leaders (N = 5)		Overall (N = 45)	
	F	Response	F	Response	F	Response
Make the complicated subject matter accessible.	2.78	A	2.60	A	2.76	A
Have mastery in the subject matter	3.03	A	2.40	D	2.96	A
Explain well the subject matter to the pupils.	3.20	A	2.60	A	3.13	A
Give many examples to the pupils.	3.23	A	2.40	D	3.13	A
Always encourage the pupils to ask a question and answer them sufficiently.	3.48	SA	3.40	SA	3.47	SA
Use simple terms for them to understand.	3.68	SA	3.60	SA	3.67	SA
Can facilitate understanding and maximum learning through my clear voice and diction	3.45	SA	3.60	SA	3.47	SA
Can transfer knowledge through specific words and examples.	3.45	SA	3.00	A	3.47	SA
Can express knowledge, beliefs using my own experiences and interests.	3.55	SA	3.40	SA	3.40	SA
Possess positive attitudes, as evidenced on verbal and non-verbal gestures.	3.55	SA	3.40	SA	3.53	SA
Present the lesson only that is visible to the pupils.	3.03	A	3.00	A	3.53	SA
Have a method to drive home a point.	3.14	A	3.40	SA	3.02	A
Use instructional tools such as films, power points, picture, etc.	3.35	SA	3.60	SA	3.17	A
Impart knowledge based on children's likes and experiences.	3.48	SA	3.40	SA	3.38	SA
Apply the teaching-learning process that is learner-centered.	3.45	SA	3.40	SA	3.47	SA
Make sure that the class is organized before the start of the lesson.	3.55	SA	3.60	SA	3.44	SA
Can control an atmosphere that is conducive to learning	3.43	SA	3.40	SA	3.42	SA
Can see to it that the learners are relaxed, free from threats, and anxiety.	3.40	SA	3.40	SA	3.40	SA
Assure that the class is learning with fun.	3.38	SA	3.40	SA	3.38	SA

Note: A=Agree; SA: Strongly agree; D= Disagree.

Table 5 presents the respondents' degree of multitasking role as to the quality of teaching. Of the 19 indicators presented, 13 were rated Strongly Agree as follows: "always encourage my pupils to ask a question and answer

them sufficiently" 3.47, "use simple terms for them to understand" 3.67, "can facilitate understanding and maximum learning through my clear voice and diction" 3.47, "can transfer knowledge through specific words and examples" 3.47, "can express knowledge, beliefs using my own experiences and interests" 3.40, "possess positive attitudes, as evidenced by my verbal and non-verbal gestures" 3.53, "present my lesson only that is visible to my pupils" 3.53, "impart knowledge based on children's likes and experiences" 3.38, "apply the teaching-learning process that is learner-centered" 3.47, "make sure that the class is organized before the start of the lesson" 3.44, "can control an atmosphere that is conducive to learning" 3.42, "can see to it that the learners are relaxed, free from threats, and anxiety" 3.40, "assure you that the class is learning with fun" 3.38.

The rest of the indicators were rated Agree, "make the complicated subject matter accessible" 2.78, "have mastery in the subject matter" 2.96, "explain well the subject matter to the pupils" and "give many examples to the pupils" 3.13, "have a method to drive home a point" 3.02 and "use instructional tools such as films, power points, picture, etc." 3.17. As a whole, respondents' degree of multitasking role as to the quality of teaching got an overall rating of 3.33, which is Strongly Agree. This indicates that a teacher's role goes beyond simply lecturing a class of students. Although a large amount of the day for a teacher is spent in the classroom, the actual teaching aspect is only a part of the role. A real teacher knows that teaching includes multitasking to makes sure the school day runs smoothly, and all pupils receive a quality education.

Table 6. Relationship between time spent for multitasking role and the profile of the respondents.

Variables	Computed chi-square	Df	Critical value	Significance	Result
A. Related works other than teaching					
Type	25.594	14	23.685	Significant	Ho rejected
School	66.794	42	58.124	Significant	Ho rejected
Age	63.995	56	74.468	Not significant	Ho accepted
Gender	26.250	14	23.685	Significant	Ho rejected
Civil status	28.984	28	41.337	Not significant	Ho accepted
Position	68.896	70	90.531	Not significant	Ho accepted
Length of service	94.875	84	106.395	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Administrative support activities					
Type	45.000	21	32.761	Significant	Ho rejected
School	61.865	63	82.529	Not significant	Ho accepted
Age	100.751	84	106.395	Not significant	Ho accepted
Gender	21.202	21	32.761	Not significant	Ho accepted
Civil status	28.672	42	58.124	Not significant	Ho accepted
Position	113.750	105	129.918	Not significant	Ho accepted
Length of service	138.844	126	153.198	Not significant	Ho accepted

Table 6 shows the type of respondents, schools where the respondents came from, as well as the gender of the respondents have significant relationships to related works other than teaching. Since their respective computed Chi-square values are more significant than their critical values at 95% confidence level, these data imply that the time spent for multitasking roles of teachers that are related to their works significantly affect their genders, type, and the school where teachers come from. Hanushek and Rivkin (2006) highlight the pivotal role of enhancing instructional quality in nearly all efforts to improve the overall quality of schools. Unfortunately, many policy recommendations tend to overlook existing evidence related to teacher labor markets and the factors influencing teacher effectiveness within the classroom. In rural areas of developing countries, Duflo and Hanna (2005) identify a prevalent issue of teacher absenteeism. Their study explores the effectiveness of a straightforward incentive program centered on teacher attendance, assessing whether it can effectively reduce teacher absenteeism and, consequently, promote more teaching activities and enhanced learning outcomes. Furthermore, Fernet, Senécal, Guay, Marsh, and Dowson (2008) research introduces the Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers (WTMST),

comprising 30 reliable and valid factors that reflect five distinct types of motivation across six different work tasks commonly performed by teachers.

Table 7. Relationship between degree multitasking role and the profile of the respondents.

Variables	Computed chi-square	Df	Critical value	Significance	Result
A. Organizational behavior					
Type	0.827	2	5.991	Not significant	Ho accepted
School	10.264	6	12.592	Not significant	Ho accepted
Age	5.928	8	15.507	Not significant	Ho accepted
Gender	2.919	2	5.991	Not significant	Ho accepted
Civil status	1.014	4	9.488	Not significant	Ho accepted
Position	11.745	10	18.307	Not significant	Ho accepted
Length of service	7.936	12	21.026	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Quality of teaching					
Type	0.100	1	3.841	Not significant	Ho accepted
School	8.029	3	7.815	Significant	Ho rejected
Age	5.578	4	9.488	Not significant	Ho accepted
Gender	1.113	1	3.841	Not significant	Ho accepted
Civil status	3.943	2	5.911	Not significant	Ho accepted
Position	2.366	5	11.070	Not significant	Ho accepted
Length of service	11.150	6	12.592	Not significant	Ho accepted

The study's findings, based on an expanded multitasking approach, strongly support the utility of the WTMST in assessing teachers' motivation regarding various work tasks. Moreover, the study confirms the stability of the WTMST across gender and teaching levels. These results are discussed within the framework of self-determination theory and the perspective of multitasking. Additionally, the study hypothesizes that the extent of teachers' involvement in multitasking significantly influences their profiles.

Table 7 reveals that the degree of the multitasking role of teachers in terms of the quality of teaching has a significant relationship to schools where the respondents come from. That is, the computed Chi-square value of 8.029, at df=3 with 0.05 level of significance, is greater than their critical values 7.815. This means that teachers coming from different elementary schools have different qualities of teaching. Kremer, Brannen, and Glennerster (2013) emphasize that in various contexts, randomized evaluations consistently demonstrate that the participation of students in school is influenced by economic factors: reducing direct costs, offering merit-based scholarships, and providing conditional cash transfers all contribute to increased school attendance. Additionally, addressing child health issues and imparting information about the potential earnings associated with education can further enhance school participation in a cost-effective manner. However, once students are in school, the research indicates that test scores remain persistently low and do not significantly improve with conventional inputs, such as hiring more teachers, acquiring additional textbooks, or providing flexible financial aid.

In contrast, educational reforms that tailor teaching to students' individual learning levels prove to be highly cost-effective in boosting learning outcomes. Similarly, initiatives that enhance accountability and incentives, such as the local recruitment of teachers on short-term contracts, show promise in improving educational outcomes. Technology also holds the potential to enhance pedagogy and accountability in education. The study underscores that addressing the challenges associated with improving both pre-primary and post-primary education is a critical task for the future.

Table 8 revealed significant variations in Organizational Behavior when teachers were grouped by their teaching positions. The obtained p-value of 0.046, which is less than the critical value of 0.05, indicates that teaching positions differ significantly from each other. This discrepancy persists irrespective of the specific school that the teachers belong to. These results align with Feather and Rauter (2004) study, which found that contract teachers reported higher job insecurity and engaged in more Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

compared to their permanent counterparts. OCBs were positively linked to perceived job insecurity for contract teachers and were negatively associated with opportunities to fulfill their influence and skill utilization work values. Conversely, OCBs were positively related to organizational commitment, organizational identification, and opportunities to fulfill variety and skill-utilization work values for permanent teachers.

Table 8. Difference in the degree of multitasking role when grouped by its profile.

Variables	F-value	P-value	Significance	Result
A. Organizational behavior				
Type	1.22	0.275	Not significant	Ho accepted
School	0.43	0.730	Not significant	Ho accepted
Age	1.80	0.147	Not significant	Ho accepted
Gender	1.03	0.316	Not significant	Ho accepted
Civil status	0.17	0.846	Not significant	Ho accepted
Position	2.67	0.046	Significant	Ho rejected
Length of service	0.45	0.839	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Quality of teaching				
Type	1.37	0.248	Not significant	Ho accepted
School	1.27	0.299	Not significant	Ho accepted
Age	1.08	0.379	Not significant	Ho accepted
Gender	1.90	0.175	Not significant	Ho accepted
Civil status	4.08	0.024	Significant	Ho rejected
Position	2.16	0.091	Not significant	Ho accepted
Length of service	3.18	0.012	Significant	Ho rejected

According to Archon (2020) that transformational leadership complements transactional leadership in predicting job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers. Job satisfaction was identified as a mediator of the influence of transformational leadership on teachers' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Moreover, the data in the table indicate disparities in teaching quality based on teachers' civil status and length of service. These findings suggest that teachers with more extensive teaching experience and differing civil statuses exhibit varying levels of teaching quality. These outcomes resonate with Voss, Gruber, and Szmigin (2007) research, which underscores that students prioritize teachers who possess knowledge, enthusiasm, approachability, and friendliness. Students primarily seek valuable teaching experiences to excel in exams and prepare for their future professions.

5. CONCLUSION

The study found out that the majority of the teachers spent 3 to 4 hours daily for administrative works. It was also revealed that both respondents (school leaders and teachers) strongly agreed that the multitasking of roles of teachers affects their teaching functions. On the test of a significant relationship, the study found out that the type of respondents, schools where the respondents came from, as well as the ages of the respondents have significant relationships to related works other than teaching. It was also revealed that the degree of the multitasking role of teachers in terms of the quality of teaching has a significant relationship to schools where the respondents come from. On the challenges and barriers of teachers relative to multitasking of roles, the majority of the teachers mentioned that they could not focus on their teaching functions due to DepEd's deliverables that need to submit before deadlines. The study concluded that teaching performance of the public-school teachers are totally affected by the multitasking roles in the school that leads to poor academic result which need supplemental activities for enhancement.

REFERENCES

Alghamdi, A., Karpinski, A. C., Lepp, A., & Barkley, J. (2020). Online and face-to-face classroom multitasking and academic performance: Moderated mediation with self-efficacy for self-regulated learning and gender. *Computers in Human Behavior, 102,* 214-222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.08.018

Alhebaishi, S. M. (2019). Investigation of EFL student teachers' emotional responses to affective situations during practicum. *European Journal of Educational Research, 8*(4), 1201-1215. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.8.4.1201

Alkahtani, M., Ahmad, A., Darmoul, S., Samman, S., Al-zabidi, A., & Matraf, K. B. (2016). Multitasking trends and impact on education: A literature review. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences, 10*(3), 1006-1012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104078

Alvarez-Risco, A., Estrada-Merino, A., Anderson-Seminario, M. d. l. M., Mlodzianowska, S., García-Ibarra, V., Villagomez-Buele, C., & Carvache-Franco, M. (2021). Multitasking behavior in online classrooms and academic performance: Case of university students in Ecuador during COVID-19 outbreak. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 18*(3), 422-434. https://doi.org/10.1108/itse-08-2020-0160

Archon, R. J. (2020). *Relating leadership style to communication satisfaction: An explanatory study in full-time working adults in the United States.* Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University.

Baran, B. (2013). The effect of multitasking to faculty members' academic works. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 13*(4), 2347-2353.

Beauvais, A. M., Stewart, J. G., DeNisco, S., & Beauvais, J. E. (2014). Factors related to academic success among nursing students: A descriptive correlational research study. *Nurse Education Today, 34*(6), 918-923.

Bi, Y., Xue, B., & Zhang, M. (2021). Learning and sharing: A multitask genetic programming approach to image feature learning. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation, 26*(2), 218-232. https://doi.org/10.1109/tevc.2021.3097043

Björk, L. G., Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Potterton, A. U. (2020). Educational reform in the USA: Superintendents' role in promoting social justice through organizational justice. *Handbook on Promoting Social Justice in Education,* 497-522. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14625-2_62

Bonilla, B. (2015). *Wireless internet use.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.

Brady, J. (2020). *Workload, accountability and stress: A comparative study of teachers' working conditions in state and private schools in England.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Brante, G. (2009). Multitasking and synchronous work: Complexities in teacher work. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(3), 430-436. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.015

Brunce, S. (2014). Digital inequality: from unequal access to differentiated use. In K. Neckerman (Ed.), Social inequality. In (pp. 355–400). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Cameron, R. J. (2018). *Rewilding the organization: An exploration of the ecosystem approach applied to human institutions.* Doctoral Dissertation Washington State University.

Chen, X., Wang, Y., Tao, D., Jiang, L., & Li, S. (2021). Antecedents of smartphone multitasking: Roles of demographics, personalities and motivations. *Internet Research, 31*(4), 1405-1443. https://doi.org/10.1108/intr-09-2019-0388

Chun, M. M., Golomb, J. D., & Turk-Browne, N. B. (2011). A taxonomy of external and internal attention. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*(1), 73-101. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100427

Crews, D. E., & Russ, M. J. (2020). The impact of individual differences on multitasking ability. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 69*(6), 1301-1319. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-04-2019-0191

DeBerard, M. S., Spielmans, G. I., & Julka, D. L. (2004). Predictors of academic achievement and retention among college freshmen: A longitudinal study. *College Student Journal, 38*(1), 66-81.

Dietrich, L. (2021). Higher expectations of teachers are not sufficient: How to take the next big step in social-emotional teacher training. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, 18*(3), 319-329. https://doi.org/10.1002/aps.1724

Duflo, E., & Hanna, R. (2005). *Monitoring works: Getting teachers to come to school (No. w11880)*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Duggan, G. B., Johnson, H., & Sørli, P. (2013). Interleaving tasks to improve performance: Users maximise the marginal rate of return. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 71*(5), 533-550.

Dux, P. (2014). Succinct survey measures of web-use skills. *Social Science Computer Review, 12*, 2017.

Etuk, E. N., Afangideh, M. E., & Uya, A. O. (2013). Students' perception of teachers' characteristics and their attitude towards mathematics in Oron education Zone, Nigeria. *International Education Studies, 6*(2), 197-204. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n2p197

Fatema, K., Syeed, M., & Miah, M. S. U. (2020). Demography of startup software companies: An empirical investigation on the success and failure. *International Journal of Computer Applications, 176*(29), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.5120/ijca2020920313

Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 81-94. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915928

Fernet, C., Senécal, C., Guay, F., Marsh, H., & Dowson, M. (2008). The work tasks motivation scale for teachers (WTMST). *Journal of Career Assessment, 16*(2), 256-279.

Fishbach, A., & Woolley, K. (2022). The structure of intrinsic motivation. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 9*(1), 339-363.

Foti, P. (2020). Research in distance learning in Greek Kindergarten schools during the pandemic of COVID-19: Possibilities, dilemmas, limitations. *European Journal of Open Education and E-Learning Studies, 5*(1), 19-40.

Haerazi, H., Irawan, L. A., Suadiyatno, T., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Triggering preservice teachers' writing skills through genre-based instructional model viewed from creativity. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 9*(1), 234-244.

Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2006). Teacher quality. *Handbook of the Economics of Education, 2*, 1051-1078.

Hargittai, E. (2007). Whose space? Differences among users and non-users of social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(1), 276–297.

Higton, J., Leonardi, S., Richards, N., Choudhoury, A., Sofroniou, N., & Owen, D. (2017). Teacher workload survey 2016. In (pp. 100). London: Department for Education.

Hjálmsdóttir, A., & Bjarnadóttir, V. S. (2021). "I have turned into a foreman here at home": Families and work–life balance in times of COVID-19 in a gender equality paradise. *Gender, Work & Organization, 28*(1), 268-283. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12552

Howard, L. (2012). *Walking the talk: Applying adult education principles to influence change.* Paper presented at the In Proceedings of Canadian Association for Studies in Adult Education (CASAE) 2012 Conference. Kitchener, ON: Wilfred Laurier University and University of Waterloo (pp. 165-172).

Ivrendi, A. (2020). Early childhood teachers' roles in free play. *Early Years, 40*(3), 273-286. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2017.1403416

Junco, R., & Cotten, S. R. (2011). Perceived academic effects of instant messaging use. *Computers & Education, 56*(2), 370-378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.08.020

Junco, R., Merson, D., & Salter, D. W. (2010). The effect of gender, ethnicity, and income on college students' use of communication technologies. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 13*(6), 619-627. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2009.0357

Kim, J. (2020). Learning and teaching online during Covid-19: Experiences of student teachers in an early childhood education practicum. *International Journal of Early Childhood, 52*(2), 145-158. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-020-00272-6

Kremer, M., Brannen, C., & Glennerster, R. (2013). The challenge of education and learning in the developing world. *Science, 340*(6130), 297-300.

Kumar, M. (2020). A study on the emotional intelligence of higher secondary school students. *Shanlax International Journal of Education, 8*(3), 114-119. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i3.2395

Laloyaux, J., Van der Linden, M., Nuechterlein, K. H., Thonon, B., & Larøi, F. (2018). A direct examination of the cognitive underpinnings of multitasking abilities: A first study examining schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research, 268*, 288-296.

Lavy, S. (2020). A review of character strengths interventions in twenty-first-century schools: Their importance and how they can be fostered. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 15*(2), 573-596. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9700-6

Lesort, T., Lomonaco, V., Stoian, A., Maltoni, D., Filliat, D., & Díaz-Rodríguez, N. (2020). Continual learning for robotics: Definition, framework, learning strategies, opportunities and challenges. *Information Fusion, 58*, 52-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.004

Luo, J., Yeung, P.-s., & Li, H. (2020). The relationship among media multitasking, academic performance and self-esteem in Chinese adolescents: The cross-lagged panel and mediation analyses. *Children and Youth Services Review, 117*, 105308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105308

Malone, T. W., & Lepper, M. R. (2021). Making learning fun: A taxonomy of intrinsic motivations for learning. In Aptitude, learning, and instruction. In (pp. 223-254). London: Routledge.

Martinez, A. D., Del Ser, J., Osaba, E., & Herrera, F. (2021). Adaptive multifactorial evolutionary optimization for multitask reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation, 26*(2), 233-247. https://doi.org/10.1109/tevc.2021.3083362

Mauno, S., Kubicek, B., Feldt, T., & Minkkinen, J. (2020). Intensified job demands and job performance: Does SOC strategy use make a difference? *Industrial Health, 58*(3), 224-237. https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2019-0067

Mehdiyev, E. (2020). Opinions of EFL students regarding autonomous learning in language teaching. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16*(2), 521-536.

Myin, E., & Van den Herik, J. C. (2021). A twofold tale of one mind: Revisiting REC's multi-storey story. *Synthese, 198*(12), 12175-12193.

Neumann, M. M., & Herodotou, C. (2020). Young children and YouTube: A global phenomenon. *Childhood Education, 96*(4), 72-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2020.1796459

Nosko, A., Wood, E., & Molema, S. (2010). All about me: Disclosure in online social networking profiles: The case of FACEBOOK. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(3), 406-418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.012

Purwanto, A., Asbari, M., Fahlevi, M., Mufid, A., Agistiawati, E., Cahyono, Y., & Suryani, P. (2020). Impact of work from home (WFH) on Indonesian teachers performance during the Covid-19 pandemic: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 29*(5), 6235-6244.

Pyne, R., Duggan, J., & Neth, T. (2007). *Connecting to the net generation: What higher education professionals need to know about today's students*. Washington, DC: NASPA.

Rubinstein, J. S., Meyer, D. E., & Evans, J. E. (2001). Executive control of cognitive processes in task switching. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 27*(4), 763-797.

Russ, M., & Crews, D. E. (2014). A survey of multitasking behaviors in organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 4*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v4i1.5155

Schieman, S., & Young, M. (2015). Who engages in work–family multitasking? A study of Canadian and American workers. *Social Indicators Research, 120*(3), 741-767. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0609-7

Stoneman, P. (2007). *The sociology and efficacy of multitasking*. Chimera Working Paper, Nr No. 2007-05.

Tropall, D. (2016). E-mail is for old people. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(7), A27.

Vanderbilt University. (2015). Variation in internet skills and uses among members of the "net generation". *Sociological Inquiry, 80*(1), 92–113.

Viac, C., & Fraser, P. (2020). *Teachers' well-being: A framework for data collection and analysis (No. 213)*. OECD Publishing.

Volman, V., & Mc Callum, A. (2020). Organization constraints on professional development: An Exploration into how institutional frameworks hold back teacher training. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education, 22*(2), 71-87.

Voss, R., Gruber, T., & Szmigin, I. (2007). Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations. *Journal of Business Research, 60*(9), 949-959.

Wortham, S., Love-Jones, R., Peters, W., Morris, S., & García-Huidobro, J. C. (2020). Educating for comprehensive well-being. *ECNU Review of Education, 3*(3), 406-436.