



Maintaining balance: Workload, stress, and well-being of public elementary school teachers as a basis for a wellness development program

Maricar B. Amoroso ^{1*} , Ivy H. Casupanan ¹ 

¹President Ramon Magsaysay State University, PHILIPPINES

*Corresponding Author: maricaramoroso4@gmail.com

Citation: Amoroso, M. B., & Casupanan, I. H. (2026). Maintaining balance: Workload, stress, and well-being of public elementary school teachers as a basis for a wellness development program. *Mediterranean Journal of Social & Behavioral Research*, 10(2), 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.29333/mjosbr/19630>

ABSTRACT

To maintain a good working environment for teachers, several factors must be considered, such as workload, stress, and well-being. This study investigated the levels of workload, stress, and well-being among 136 public elementary school teachers selected through cluster sampling in a town in Zambales, Philippines, during the 2025–2026 school year. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected via an online survey. The research tools for the study were adopted and modified. Descriptive and inferential statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, Analysis of Variance, Pearson-r, and simple linear regression were employed with the aid of the software SPSS 23. The profile of a typical respondent was a married female, aged 41–50, holding a Teacher 1 position with Master's degree units and 11–15 years of experience. Findings indicated that while teachers generally accepted their workload and acknowledged associated stress, they maintained a positive outlook on their well-being, particularly regarding student rapport and organizational interaction. Inferential analysis revealed no significant differences in the level of workload, stress and well-being among teachers based on their demographic profile. The study also established a significant relationship between workload, stress, and well-being, confirming that both workload and stress predicted a teacher's well-being. Consequently, the study recommends a Teacher Wellness Development Program focusing on workload optimization, resilience building, and enhanced organizational support to safeguard the well-being of the teaching force.

Keywords: public elementary teachers, workload, stress, well-being, wellness program, correlation research

Received: 21 May 2026 ♦ Accepted: 09 Aug. 2026

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the teaching profession has faced increasing scrutiny due to escalating work demands and their effects on teacher well-being. Workload intensification—marked by longer hours, increased paperwork, and expanded role expectations—has emerged as a major stressor (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020), contributing to declining mental health, job satisfaction, and teacher retention globally (Collie, 2017). These concerns highlight the urgent need for systemic interventions that place teacher wellness at the core of educational reform.

In the ASEAN region, teacher workload and well-being are similarly pressing concerns, complicated by issues such as limited resources, socio-economic disparities, and ongoing educational reforms. The COVID-19 pandemic worsened these challenges by accelerating digital transitions without adequate infrastructure or training (Nguyen & Le, 2021). Even in relatively prepared systems like Malaysia and Singapore, educators reported heightened workloads and

fatigue from adapting to hybrid models (Nang et al., 2022). These findings underscore the systemic and contextual nature of teacher stress in ASEAN, calling for localized interventions informed by global practices.

In the Philippines, teacher well-being and productivity reflects both global and regional trends, while also presenting unique challenges. Ellovido and Quirap (2024) identified workload overload, administrative compliance, and overcrowded classrooms as key stressors for public elementary school teachers. Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction with the school-based management process is still acceptable among stakeholders (Pasubillo & Asio, 2023). In rural settings, Aquino (2022) noted persistent stress among teachers navigating the difficulties of distance learning. Simbre and Ancho (2023) emphasized lingering post-pandemic challenges, including ongoing struggles with instructional modalities and strategies. On the other hand, Asio (2021) emphasized the determinants of work productivity among teachers. At the same time, teachers also revealed some level of procrastination during the time of pandemic (Asio &

Table 1. Frequency distribution of the respondents

Elementary Schools	Frequency	Percentage
AES	8	5.59
BMES	15	10.49
CES	8	5.59
DES	7	4.90
DMES	8	5.59
LPES	13	9.09
MES	4	2.80
NES	8	5.59
OES	5	3.50
SJPES	13	9.09
SJCES	8	5.59
SNES	21	14.69
SPES	8	5.59
SRNES	9	6.29
SES	8	5.59
Total	143	100.00

Riego de Dios, 2021). Furthermore, much of the local literature centers on individual and behavioral coping strategies rather than systemic solutions, reflecting a reactive rather than proactive stance (Orte et al., (2024; Garcia & Asio, 2023).

From the aforementioned global and local literature on a teacher's workload, stress, and well-being, authors seek to show the varying degrees of difference and relationships among the three variables. There is a dearth of literature considering how workload and stress impact a teacher's well-being separately. This is the gap in the study that needs to be investigated and must be answered. This idea fueled the authors' interest in investigating the phenomenon.

This study seeks to address these gaps through a comprehensive, data-driven investigation of teacher well-being in the Philippines. Its four objectives are: (1) assess workload levels among public elementary teachers, (2) evaluate overall well-being, (3) identify key stressors, and (4) develop a context-specific wellness program based on empirical data. By including both urban and rural contexts, the study's main contributions are to inform inclusive, practical, and policy-relevant interventions. Ultimately, enhancing teacher well-being is not just a matter of professional support; it is essential for improving educational outcomes, reducing attrition, and fostering resilient school communities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This investigation employed a descriptive-correlational research design in order for the researcher to analyze the elementary school teachers' workload, stress, and well-being. At the same time, the study also aims to determine any underlying differences in the workload, stress, and well-being among the teachers including the interrelationships between the three variables.

This design allows for the exploration of patterns, associations, and potential correlations between these variables without manipulating them. Descriptive designs primarily answer descriptive questions (Creswell & Guetterman, 2021) and would provide a clear snapshot of the workload, stress levels, and well-being of teachers. Meanwhile correlational analysis would reveal the strength and direction of relationships between these factors (Wilson & Joye, 2016).

Descriptive statistics enabled the researchers to summarize and describe the characteristics of these variables within the sample of elementary school teachers. Correlational analysis would then be used to examine how workload correlates with stress levels and well-being among elementary school teachers. This analysis would help identify whether there is a relationship between workload and teachers' stress levels, as well as how workload impacts their overall well-being.

Respondents of the Study

The chosen population for this study were elementary school teachers from the Municipality of San Narciso, Zambales. The district of San Narciso has at least 15 elementary schools. **Table 1** shows the distribution of teachers in the 15 public elementary schools located in the District of San Narciso.

To be eligible for the study, the researchers set up the following eligibility criteria: a) must be a licensed professional teacher; b) must have a minimum teaching experience of two years; c) must be assigned to a public elementary school; and d) must be willing to participate in the survey. Excluded from the list are pre-service teachers, private school teachers, teachers in the secondary level, and early entry teachers.

In this study, the researcher employed a cluster sampling technique in order to achieve the desired number of samples for the study. Cluster sampling is a probability sampling method where a population is subdivided into naturally occurring groups called clusters. Also, the study used an appropriate sampling method to provide an optimal number of respondents per school by means of Raosoft Sampling calculator. This study was conducted on 15 public elementary schools located in the district of San Narciso, Zambales. It is composed of a total of 143 elementary school teachers however, only 136 teachers were able to return the survey tool which comprised 95% return rate. The remaining 5% who did not answer were absent during data collection or were unwilling to participate. The study was conducted during the 2025-2026 school year, and the data-gathering period ran from February to March, 2026.

Research Instrument

In order for the study to gather important data for the study, the researcher adopted and modified a research tool which will address the objectives of the current research. The researcher was privileged enough to find three different research questionnaires that particularly address the needed data for the study. They came from open sources (e.g. ResearchGate, Google Scholar) wherein one can download it freely without any firewall or barriers.

The first instrument came from the work of Maquidato and Bayani (2024) wherein the level of teachers' workload was assessed comprehensively. It is composed of 15 items/ statements which reflected the teachers' workload context. A four-point Likert scale was used to elicit the responses which include: 4-Strongly Agree; 3-Agree; 2-Disagree; and 1-Strongly Disagree.

For the second instrument, it was adopted from the past paper of Chen et al., (2022). This research tool was comprised originally of 9 items all which corresponded to the different stress that teachers' experience in their work. It is originally answered by a five-point Likert scale which also has a corresponding response of: 5-Strongly Agree; 4-Agree; 3-Neutral; 2 Disagree; and 1-Strongly Disagree.

And for the last instrument, Collie et al., (2015) developed a tool to measure the workload of teachers. Originally, it is composed of 16 items. It is answered or scored by the respondents with the following corresponding answer: 7-Positively; 6-Most Positively; 5-More Positively than Negatively; 4-Neither Positively nor Negatively; 3-More Negatively than Positively; 2-Mostly Negatively; and 1-Negatively.

Moreover, the research questionnaire was modified to some extent especially in the aspect of teachers' stress scale (additional one item) and in the teachers' workload (four additional items). Finally, the modified instrument is composed of four major sections: the first section is the basic demographic profile of the respondents, the second section is the level of teachers' workload, the third section is comprised of the level of teachers' stress, and the last section is for the teachers' level of well-being.

The researcher also intended to ensure the validity and reliability of the modified instrument since, most of its part came from foreign countries, the researcher might as well consider revalidate the newly modified research tool by three experts in the field. The researcher considered, a Head Teacher, a Master Teacher, and a School Principal. These professionals were experts considering their job description and designation. It might be more advantageous if they were also publishing research. Their feedback helped improve the research instrument in terms of significance, clarity, and alignment of the items with the purpose of the study. After a careful revision of the possible suggestions and recommendations of the expert panels, the new instrument also underwent pilot testing to individuals or professionals which are not part of the study to establish clarity, reliability and effectiveness of the modifications. For the reliability test, the researcher used a Cronbach's alpha test with a benchmark coefficient score of .70 and above implying acceptability and internal consistency for the research items. The

modified instrument yielded an overall Cronbach coefficient of .957 which is considered highly reliable.

Statistical Analysis

To arrive at a definitive generalization for the study, a series of statistical treatments was employed using the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. The goal of the statistical analysis is to provide clear, data-driven insights to guide the researcher in proposing a wellness development program for public elementary school teachers in the district of San Narciso, Zambales. Descriptive statistics were used, such as frequency, percentage and mean distribution for the demographic profile and the analysis of the teachers' level of workload, stress, and well-being. On the other hand, inferential analysis involved statistical treatments such as t-test and Analysis of Variance for the test of difference for the level of workload, stress, and well-being of teachers and Pearson-r and Linear Regression for the test of association and influence of workload and stress on the teacher's well-being.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the 134 teacher-respondents, revealing a mature and predominantly female workforce. The participants have a mean age of 43.98 years, with the largest plurality falling within the 41-50 age bracket ($n = 56$, 41.8%), and a significant majority identifying as female ($n = 116$, 86.8%). Regarding marital status, most respondents are married ($n = 94$, 70.1%). Academically, the cohort is characterized by ongoing professional development, as over half have earned Master's units ($n = 73$, 54.5%), though only 17.2% have completed a Master's or Doctoral degree. Professionally, the respondents are experienced educators with a mean

Table 2. Frequency and percentage distribution on the teacher-respondents' demographic profile

Profile Variables		Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Age (Years) <i>Mean= 43.98 years old</i>	21-30 years old	9	6.7
	31-40 years old	36	26.9
	41-50 years old	56	41.8
	51 years old and above	33	24.6
Sex	Female	116	86.8
	Male	18	13.4
Civil Status	Married	94	70.1
	Separated	6	4.5
	Single	27	20.1
	Widow	7	5.2
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree Graduate	38	28.4
	Masteral Units Earned	73	54.5
	Master's Graduate	19	14.2
	Doctoral Graduate	4	3.0
Position/ Designation	Teacher 1	46	34.3
	Teacher 2	26	19.4
	Teacher 3	38	28.4
	Teacher 4	8	6.0
	Master Teacher 1	7	5.2
	Master Teacher 2	9	6.7
Years in Teaching <i>Mean= 16.92 years</i>	0-5 years	6	4.5
	6-10 years	25	18.7
	11-15 years	32	23.9
	16-20 years	29	21.6
	21 -25 years	20	14.9
	26-30 years	15	11.2
	31 years and above	7	5.2

Table 2 (Continued). Frequency and percentage distribution on the teacher-respondents' demographic profile

Profile Variables	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Assigned Grade Level		
Floater	2	1.5
Grade 1	19	14.2
Grade 2	21	15.7
Grade 3	17	12.7
Grade 4	22	16.4
Grade 5	20	14.9
Grade 6	17	12.7
Kindergarten	16	11.9
Total	136	100.0

Table 3. Level of teacher-respondents' workload in terms of duties and obligations

Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. I find myself having to prepare a priority list to get all the things I have to do.	3.43	Strongly Agree
2. There are times when I cannot meet everyone's expectations.	3.19	Agree
3. Many times, I have to cancel commitments outside to meet my work demands.	3.20	Agree
4. I seem to have more commitments to overcome than some other teachers I know.	2.91	Agree
5. I cannot ever seem to catch up with the work assigned to me.	2.42	Disagree
6. I feel that my workload as a teacher aligns well with my duties and obligations in the educational setting.	3.25	Strongly Agree
7. The tasks and responsibilities assigned to me as a teacher reflect the expectations of my role effectively.	3.34	Strongly Agree
8. The work that I handle as a teacher is manageable within the scope of my duties and responsibilities.	3.35	Strongly Agree
9. My work as a teacher sometimes exceeds what is expected of me.	3.24	Agree
10. I think that there is a balance between the duties and obligations I have as a teacher and the workload assigned to me.	3.08	Agree
Overall Mean	3.14	Agree

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.24 – Agree; 1.75-2.49 – Disagree; 1.00-1.74 – Strongly Disagree

Table 4. Level of teacher-respondents' workload in terms of energy

Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. I find it necessary to push myself beyond my typical capacity to ensure the completion of all my tasks.	3.19	Agree
2. I just cannot find the energy to do all the things expected of me.	2.65	Agree
3. I have to do things less carefully in order to get everything done.	2.75	Agree
4. I feel like my work leaves me mentally fatigued or drained.	2.85	Agree
5. I have a number of things to do which I don't really have enough energy to comply them.	2.80	Agree
6. I feel motivated to tackle my workload as a teacher every day.	3.15	Agree
7. My vigor to work is consistent when managing my load as a teacher.	3.10	Agree
8. I find that my work as a teacher sometimes drains my energy and leaves me feeling fatigued.	3.06	Agree
9. I sometimes struggle to maintain high energy levels while handling the demands of my work as a teacher.	3.07	Agree
10. Overall, I feel invigorated and enthusiastic about my work as a teacher, despite the challenges of my workload.	3.19	Agree
Overall Mean	2.98	Agree

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.24 – Agree; 1.75-2.49 – Disagree; 1.00-1.74 – Strongly Disagree

of 16.92 years in teaching; the most frequent experience interval is 11–15 years ($n = 32$, 23.9%). In terms of designation, Teacher 1 ($n = 46$, 34.3%) and Teacher 3 ($n = 38$, 28.4%) are the most common positions, while the distribution across assigned grade levels (Kindergarten to Grade 6) remains relatively balanced, with Grade 4 having the highest representation ($n = 22$, 16.4%).

Table 3 illustrates the perceived workload of teacher-respondents regarding their professional duties and obligations, yielding an overall mean of 3.14, which indicates a general level of agreement with the provided statements. The highest mean score was recorded for the necessity of preparing priority lists to manage tasks ($M = 3.43$), followed closely by the perception that work remains manageable ($M = 3.35$) and effectively reflects role expectations ($M = 3.34$). While respondents strongly agree that their workload aligns with their educational setting ($M = 3.25$), there is a clear acknowledgment of the pressure to meet work demands, as evidenced by the need to cancel outside commitments ($M = 3.20$) and the recognition that work

occasionally exceeds expectations ($M = 3.24$). Notably, the lowest mean was observed regarding the inability to catch up with assigned work ($M = 2.42$), suggesting that despite the heavy reliance on prioritization and personal sacrifice, the educators still maintain a functional level of control over their professional responsibilities. Inferences drawn from these findings suggest that while the workload is heavy and encroaches on personal time—reflecting the “intensification” of teaching often noted in educational management literature—the teachers maintain a strong sense of professional alignment and perceived competence in fulfilling their institutional mandates.

Table 4 presents the level of teacher-respondents' workload in terms of energy, yielding an overall mean of 2.98, which falls under the “Agree” interpretation. The data indicates a complex intersection of professional resilience and physical exhaustion, as respondents reported the highest mean scores for both the necessity of pushing beyond their typical capacity to complete tasks ($M = 3.19$) and their ability to remain invigorated and enthusiastic despite workload challenges ($M = 3.19$).

Table 5. Level of teacher-respondents' workload in terms of time

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
1. I need more hours to do all the things that are expected of me.	3.17	Agree
2. There are too many demands on my time.	2.95	Agree
3. Sometimes, I feel like there are not enough hours in the day for me to complete my tasks.	3.10	Agree
4. I have things to do which I do not have time for.	2.93	Agree
5. I do not ever seem to have time for myself.	2.82	Agree
6. I have enough time to complete my tasks and responsibilities as a teacher efficiently.	2.99	Agree
7. I often find myself pressed for time to manage all the duties and obligations expected of me as a teacher.	3.01	Agree
8. I feel that I can balance my work effectively within the available time as a teacher.	3.04	Agree
9. Time constraints frequently impact my ability to devote adequate attention to all aspects of my workload as a teacher.	2.99	Agree
10. I generally feel that there is sufficient time to address the various demands of my workload as a teacher.	2.87	Agree
Overall Mean	2.99	Agree

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.24 – Agree; 1.75-2.49 – Disagree; 1.00-1.74 – Strongly Disagree

Table 6. Level of teacher-respondents' stress in terms of lack of social support

Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. I feel stressed when encountering issues with my students' families.	3.04	Agree
2. I feel stressed for not having support from the administrators at my school.	3.00	Agree
3. I feel stressed for not having support from colleagues at my school.	2.87	Agree
4. I feel stressed for not having support from my family and friends.	2.78	Agree
5. I feel stressed for having to manage student behaviors.	3.10	Agree
6. I feel stressed for not having support by my supervisors in handling work-related stress as a teacher.	2.85	Agree
7. I often experience stressed from a lack of support from peers or superiors when dealing with stress in my teaching role.	2.79	Agree
8. I often experience inadequate support from everyone in alleviating my stress levels as a teacher.	2.70	Agree
9. I feel isolated and unsupported in managing stress related to my work as a teacher.	2.59	Agree
10. I believe that improved social support systems would help me cope better with stress in my teaching environment.	3.24	Agree
Overall Mean	2.87	Agree

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.24 – Agree; 1.75-2.49 – Disagree; 1.00-1.74 – Strongly Disagree

While teachers largely maintain high levels of motivation ($M = 3.15$) and consistent vigor ($M = 3.10$), they also acknowledge the physiological toll of their roles, specifically noting that work demands frequently lead to mental fatigue ($M = 2.85$) and occasional struggles to maintain energy levels ($M = 3.07$). Interestingly, the lowest mean was observed for the inability to find energy for expected tasks ($M = 2.65$), suggesting that while the respondents are operating at a high energy cost that involves feeling drained ($M = 3.06$), they generally manage to muster the requisite effort to fulfill their professional mandates. These findings suggest a state of "functional exhaustion," where teachers successfully maintain professional standards and vigor through sheer effort, yet do so at the cost of significant cognitive and physical drain. The inference for educational management is that while the current energy levels are sustainable in the short term due to high teacher morale, the systemic reliance on teachers "pushing beyond capacity" poses a long-term risk for burnout and a gradual decline in pedagogical quality.

Table 5 delineates the teacher-respondents' perceptions of workload relative to time management, resulting in an overall mean of 2.99, interpreted as "Agree." The data reveals a pervasive sense of temporal scarcity, with the highest mean score attributed to the perceived need for more hours to fulfill professional expectations ($M = 3.17$), followed by the feeling that the standard day lacks sufficient time for task completion ($M = 3.10$). Despite these pressures and the admission of being pressed for time ($M = 3.01$), there is a paradoxical indication of self-efficacy, as respondents also agree that they can balance their work effectively within available time ($M = 3.04$) and complete tasks efficiently ($M = 2.99$). Conversely, the lowest mean

scores were associated with the total lack of personal time ($M = 2.82$) and the general sufficiency of time to address all demands ($M = 2.87$), suggesting that while teachers struggle with time constraints and the subsequent impact on their attention to detail ($M = 2.99$), they are navigating these boundaries without a total loss of work-life equilibrium. These results lead to the inference that teachers are caught in a "temporal squeeze," where they maintain a professional facade of effective time management while privately struggling with a chronic lack of personal time and the persistent pressure of unfinished tasks. This suggest that the workload is optimized for institutional efficiency but fails to account for the temporal "breathing room" necessary for deep pedagogical reflection and personal well-being.

Table 6 demonstrates that teacher-respondents experience a moderate level of stress stemming from perceived deficits in social support, reflected in an overall mean of 2.87 with an overall interpretation of "Agree." The most significant stressors identified are behavioral management of students ($M = 3.10$) and challenging interactions with students' families ($M = 3.04$), suggesting that the interface between the classroom and external stakeholders is a primary site of tension. While teachers report feeling relatively less isolated ($M = 2.59$) or broadly unsupported by everyone ($M = 2.70$), they nonetheless indicate that a lack of administrative support ($M = 3.00$) contributes notably to their stress levels. Crucially, the highest mean in the set ($M = 3.24$) reflects a strong belief that improved social support systems are essential for better coping within the teaching environment. Inferences from these findings suggest that while teachers are not entirely "socially isolated," there is a clear "support gap" regarding specialized stressors like student discipline and parental

Table 7. Level of teacher-respondents' stress in terms of teaching-related demands

Teaching-Related Demands	Mean	Interpretation
1. I felt stressed for having too much teaching work to do.	3.00	Agree
2. The teaching-related demands placed on me as a teacher significantly contribute to my overall stress levels.	2.92	Agree
3. I felt stressed about not doing a good job with my teaching.	2.98	Agree
4. I often feel overwhelmed by the teaching-related tasks and responsibilities that I must fulfill.	3.07	Agree
5. I felt stressed for not being able to meet the diverse learning needs of my students.	3.05	Agree
6. Balancing the various teaching-related demands with other responsibilities adds to my stress as a teacher.	3.00	Agree
7. I felt stressed for not having enough time to complete my teaching work (e.g. preparing, teaching the curricular content).	3.06	Agree
8. The level of stress I experience is closely tied to the demands of lesson planning, grading, and classroom management.	2.94	Agree
9. Meeting the teaching-related demands effectively is a source of stress for me in my teaching role.	2.81	Agree
10. I find it challenging to manage the teaching-related demands while maintaining a healthy level of well-being and reducing stress.	3.14	Agree
Overall Mean	3.00	Agree

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.24 – Agree; 1.75-2.49 – Disagree; 1.00-1.74 – Strongly Disagree

Table 8. Teacher-respondents' well being in terms of workload

Statements	Mean	Interpretation
Currently, how do the following aspects of being a teacher affect your well-being?		
1. Marking work	3.03	Positively
2. Fitting everything in to the allotted time	2.97	Positively
3. Administrative work related to teaching	2.93	Positively
4. Work I complete outside of school hours for teaching	2.90	Positively
5. Working to finish my teaching tasks	3.13	Positively
6. Staying late after work for meetings and activities	2.84	Positively
7. Positive contributions to my overall sense of well-being.	3.15	Positively
8. Manageable and well-supported	3.14	Positively
9. Balanced work effectively enhances overall performance as a teacher.	3.19	Positively
10. Demands of my work sometimes negatively impact my performance.	2.94	Positively
Overall Mean	3.02	Positively

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Most Positively; 2.50-3.24 – Positively; 1.75-2.49 – Negatively; 1.00-1.74 – Most Negatively

engagement. This underscores the need for institutional leadership to move beyond general encouragement and implement targeted support mechanisms—such as peer mentoring or structured administrative backing—to mitigate the relational burdens of the profession.

The analysis of **Table 7** indicates that teaching-related demands constitute a consistent and significant source of stress for the respondents, as evidenced by an overall mean of 3.00 and an overall interpretation of "Agree." The data highlights a critical struggle with professional equilibrium; the highest mean ($M = 3.14$) suggests that teachers find it particularly challenging to fulfill their pedagogical requirements while maintaining their personal well-being. This stress is fueled by a sense of being overwhelmed by tasks ($M = 3.07$) and a chronic lack of time for essential prep work and curricular delivery ($M = 3.06$). Notably, the respondents also experience internal pressure related to their professional efficacy, reporting stress over their perceived inability to meet the diverse learning needs of their students ($M = 3.05$) and general concerns about the quality of their instruction ($M = 2.98$). Inferences drawn from these findings point toward a performance-well-being paradox, where the drive to provide high-quality, inclusive education under tight temporal and volume constraints creates a self-perpetuating cycle of stress. This suggests that the stressors are not merely administrative but are deeply embedded in the core instructional mission, indicating that any intervention must focus on streamlining core pedagogical workflows rather than just reducing extra duties.

Table 8 reveals an intriguing psychological phenomenon among teacher-respondents: despite the high stress and volume reported in previous tables, they perceive the core aspects of their workload as having a constructive influence on their professional well-being ($M = 3.02$) with an overall interpretation of "positively." The data shows that the highest positive impact is derived from the belief that balancing work effectively enhances their performance ($M = 3.19$) and the intrinsic satisfaction of completing teaching tasks ($M = 3.13$). While administrative burdens ($M = 2.93$) and staying late for meetings ($M = 2.84$) yield lower scores, they are still remarkably interpreted as contributing positively to the respondents' well-being. These findings suggest a strong "professional identity" effect, where teachers derive their sense of purpose and self-actualization directly from the completion of their duties, even those that are objectively taxing. The inference drawn here is that the respondents likely view their workload through the lens of "eustress" (positive stress) or vocational commitment, where the act of meeting high demands reinforces their perceived competence and dedication. However, from a management perspective, this "positive" interpretation of heavy workloads may mask underlying fragility, indicating that teachers are using their professional passion as a primary coping mechanism to buffer against systemic overextension.

The data in **Table 9** underscores a robust organizational climate where institutional health serves as a primary driver of teacher well-being, yielding a high overall mean of 3.22 (*Positively*). Analysis reveals

Table 9. Teacher-respondents' well being in terms of organization

Statements	Mean	Interpretation
Currently, how do the following aspects of being a teacher affect your well-being?		
1. Relations with administrators at my school	3.24	Positively
2. Support offered by school leadership	3.26	Most Positively
3. Recognition for my teaching	3.22	Positively
4. School rules and procedures that are in place	3.18	Positively
5. Communication between members of the school	3.22	Positively
6. Participation in school-level decision making	3.19	Positively
7. Administrative support in the school	3.22	Positively
8. Collaborative relationships with colleagues	3.25	Most Positively
9. Clarity of communication and expectations from the administration	3.22	Positively
10. Availability of resources and tools for teaching	3.19	Positively
Overall Mean	3.22	Positively

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Most Positively; 2.50-3.24 – Positively; 1.75-2.49 – Negatively; 1.00-1.74 – Most Negatively

Table 10. Teacher-respondents' well being in terms of student-interaction

Student-Interaction	Mean	Interpretation
Currently, how do the following aspects of being a teacher affect your well-being?		
1. Student behavior	3.10	Positively
2. Relations with students in my class	3.28	Most Positively
3. Student motivation	3.25	Most Positively
4. Classroom management	3.25	Most Positively
5. Positive interactions	3.24	Positively
6. Meaningful connections	3.28	Most Positively
7. Dealing with challenging student behaviors	3.16	Positively
8. Support and guidance to students	3.22	Positively
9. Effective communication	3.21	Positively
10. Supportive and engaging classroom environment	3.28	Most Positively
Overall Mean	3.23	Positively

Legend: 3.25-4.00 – Most Positively; 2.50-3.24 – Positively; 1.75-2.49 – Negatively; 1.00-1.74 – Most Negatively

Table 11. Test of differences on the teachers' workload, stress, and well-being

Sex	N	Mean (SD) Workload	t (Sig.)	Mean (SD) Stress	t (Sig.)	Mean (SD) Well-Being	t (Sig.)
Female	116	3.03 (0.366)	-0.275	2.91 (0.490)	-1.217	3.14 (0.386)	-1.275
Male	18	3.06 (0.346)	(.783)	3.07 (0.561)	(.226)	3.27 (0.453)	(.205)

Note: df = 132; $p > .05$

that leadership and peer dynamics are the most influential factors, with support from school leadership ($M = 3.26$) and collaborative relationships with colleagues ($M = 3.25$) both receiving the highest qualitative interpretation of *Most Positively*. Furthermore, consistent positive ratings for administrative support ($M = 3.22$), communication clarity ($M = 3.22$), and professional recognition ($M = 3.22$) indicate a culture of transparency and mutual respect. Even the more structural aspects of the organization, such as rules and procedures ($M = 3.18$) and the availability of resources ($M = 3.19$), are viewed as contributing favorably to the teachers' professional state. Inferences from these findings suggest that the school organization functions as a "protective layer" for its staff; while previous tables established that teachers are heavily taxed by time and workload, their well-being is effectively anchored by a supportive, communicative, and collaborative environment. This highlights that for these educators, the relational and structural stability of the workplace acts as a critical compensatory mechanism against the pressures of the teaching profession.

The data in **Table 10** illustrates that student interaction serves as a primary source of professional fulfillment and a critical pillar of teacher well-being, yielding a high overall mean of 3.23 (*Positively*). The most profound impacts on well-being are derived from the relational and emotional core of teaching, with classroom relations, meaningful

connections, and the maintenance of a supportive environment all sharing the highest mean score ($M = 3.28$). Teachers also report that student motivation ($M = 3.25$) and their own efficacy in classroom management ($M = 3.25$) contribute significantly to their positive professional state. Notably, even the typically taxing aspects of the classroom, such as general student behavior ($M = 3.10$) and dealing with challenging behaviors ($M = 3.16$), are interpreted as having a positive influence on well-being. These findings lead to the inference that the teacher-student bond is the "existential anchor" for these educators; while previous tables established that teachers are strained by administrative time and energy demands, the actual practice of engaging with and supporting students acts as a regenerative force. This suggests that pedagogical success and the resulting emotional rewards are the fundamental drivers of resilience, effectively neutralizing the more clinical or bureaucratic stressors of the educational environment.

Table 11 presents the results of independent samples *t*-tests examining differences in workload, stress, and well-being among teacher-respondents when grouped by sex. The analysis reveals that sex does not significantly influence any of the three primary variables, as all *p*-values exceeded the standard .05 threshold. Specifically, there was no significant difference in perceived workload ($t = -0.275$, $p = .783$), stress levels ($t = -1.217$, $p = .226$), or overall well-being ($t = -1.275$, $p = .205$)

Table 12. Test of differences on the teachers' workload, stress, and well-being

Profile	F-Value (Workload)	p-value	F-Value (Stress)	p-value	F-Value (Well-Being)	p-value
Age	0.409	.747	0.592	.621	0.944	.421
Civil Status	1.888	.135	0.872	.458	0.405	.750
Highest Educ. Attain.	1.648	.182	0.856	.466	0.263	.852
Position/ Designation	1.055	.389	0.362	.874	0.639	.670
Years of Teaching	1.612	.149	0.737	.621	2.025	.067
Grade Level	0.517	.821	0.667	.699	0.753	.627

Note: $p > .05$

Table 13. Relationships between teachers' level of workload, stress, and well-being

Variables	1	2	3
1. Level of Workload	-	.698*	.688*
2. Level of Stress		-	.509*
3. Well-Being			-

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 14. Linear regression on level of workload on teachers' well-being

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.871	0.211		4.124	.000
Level of Workload	0.752	0.069	0.688	10.900	.000

Note: $F(1, 132) = 118.807$; $p = .000$; $R^2 = .688$

between female and male educators. These findings suggest that the professional pressures and psychological states discussed in previous tables are experienced uniformly across the faculty, regardless of sex. Inferences from these results point toward the systemic nature of educational demands; the "temporal squeeze" and "workload intensification" identified earlier appear to be inherent to the teaching role itself rather than being moderated by sex-based differences in role perception or coping strategies. Consequently, institutional interventions aimed at reducing stress or enhancing well-being should be applied universally across the teaching force, as the data indicates a shared professional experience across the sampled population.

Table 12 displays the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) used to determine if significant differences exist in teachers' workload, stress, and well-being when categorized by various demographic profiles. The statistical analysis reveals that none of the profile variables—Age, Civil Status, Highest Educational Attainment, Position, Years of Teaching, or Grade Level—yielded a significant effect on any of the three primary constructs, as all p -values consistently exceeded the .05 alpha level. While Years of Teaching approached a marginal level of interest regarding well-being ($F = 2.025$, $p = .067$), it ultimately failed to reach statistical significance. These results indicate that the experiences of workload intensification, stress, and professional well-being are remarkably homogenous across the entire teaching force, regardless of maturity, tenure, or administrative rank. Inferences from this data suggest that the pressures identified in this study are structural and environmental rather than individual; the challenges of the teaching profession in this context are so pervasive that they transcend demographic boundaries, affecting a novice teacher as intensely as a seasoned veteran. Consequently, institutional policies and wellness programs do not need to be stratified by demographic groups but should instead focus on systemic reforms that address the foundational causes of stress and workload for all educators.

Table 13 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients between teachers' level of workload, stress, and well-being, revealing statistically significant positive relationships among all three constructs ($p < .05$). A strong positive correlation was observed between workload and stress

($r = .698$), indicating that as duties, energy demands, and time constraints increase, there is a commensurate rise in perceived stress. Interestingly, workload also shares a strong positive relationship with well-being ($r = .688$), while stress and well-being are moderately correlated ($r = .509$). These findings suggest a complex psychological dynamic within the teaching profession: while a high workload undeniably drives stress, it simultaneously serves as a vehicle for professional well-being, likely through the fulfillment of vocational goals and meaningful student engagement identified in earlier tables. Inferences drawn from this data point to the existence of "productive stress," where the very tasks that tax the teacher's resources also provide the professional rewards necessary to sustain their sense of purpose. However, the strength of the workload-stress link serves as a critical warning that without institutional buffers, the positive aspects of well-being may eventually be overwhelmed by the physiological and mental costs of chronic overextension.

Table 14 presents the results of a simple linear regression analysis conducted to determine the predictive power of workload on teachers' well-being. The regression model is statistically significant, $F(1, 132) = 118.807$, $p = .000$, with workload explaining 68.8% ($R^2 = .688$) of the variance in well-being. The analysis yielded a significant unstandardized coefficient ($B = 0.752$, $t = 10.900$, $p = .000$), indicating that for every one-unit increase in the level of workload, teacher well-being is predicted to increase by 0.752 units. These findings provide empirical weight to the "vocational fulfillment" hypothesis suggested in previous tables; rather than acting solely as a detractor, the workload serves as a primary driver of professional well-being in this cohort. The inference drawn is that the core duties of teaching are so inextricably linked to a teacher's sense of purpose and efficacy that their well-being is largely predicated on their active engagement with these tasks. However, from a management perspective, the high R^2 value suggests an intense reliance on work-related achievement for emotional stability, reinforcing the need for systemic support to ensure this "high-stakes" well-being does not collapse under the weight of the stress levels previously identified.

Table 15. Linear regression on the influence of level of stress on teachers' well-being

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.975	0.176		11.213	.000
Level of Stress	0.403	0.059	0.509	6.800	.000

Note: $F(1, 132) = 46.240$; $p = .000$; $R^2 = .259$

Table 15 presents the simple linear regression analysis examining the predictive influence of stress on teachers' well-being. The model is statistically significant, $F(1, 132) = 46.240$, $p = .000$, indicating that stress significantly predicts professional well-being, though it accounts for a notably smaller portion of the variance ($R^2 = .259$) compared to the workload model. The analysis yielded a significant positive coefficient ($B = 0.403$, $t = 6.800$, $p = .000$), suggesting that for every one-unit increase in stress, there is a predicted 0.403-unit increase in well-being. These findings reinforce a recurring theme in the dataset: the presence of "eustress," where the challenges inherent in teaching are perceived not merely as burdens, but as necessary components of a meaningful and fulfilling professional life. The inference drawn here is that while stress is a significant predictor, its lower R^2 suggests that well-being is more heavily anchored in the functional output of work (as seen in **Table 14**) than in the emotional experience of stress itself. For educational managers, this indicates that while stress is positively linked to well-being in this context, it remains a less efficient driver of morale than productive workload, reinforcing the need to protect the "rewarding" aspects of teaching from being overshadowed by purely negative stressors.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this study present a compelling paradox, where the high intensity of the teaching profession serves simultaneously as a significant stressor and the primary source of professional well-being. Descriptive data from **Tables 3** through **5** establish that teachers are navigating a temporary squeeze and exhaustion, characterized by a pervasive need to push beyond typical capacities and a chronic lack of personal time. Creagh et al. (2025) shared that the effect of workload and work intensification negatively affects teachers. Wang (2024) unveiled that a negative relationship between workload and support, engagement, and psychological well-being among teachers. Carroll et al., (2022) also claimed that early career teachers, primary teachers, and teachers reported very or extremely stressed and burned out. However, this workload is not viewed as purely detrimental. The correlational and regression analyses in **Tables 13** and **14** reveal that workload is the strongest predictor of well-being, suggesting that for these educators, professional fulfillment is inextricably linked to the active execution of their pedagogical duties. This finding supports the past study of Asio and Riego de Dios, (2019) regarding what an ideal educator should be. Mondejar and Asio (2022) also shared that a good human resource management practice is a key for teacher retention. Since during the time of pandemic, most teachers had challenging time and experiences for instance during the implementation of the alternative delivery mode, additional workload were given to them but they still were able to accomplish the tasks at hand (Asio & Jimenez, 2021). Similarly, Mendoza et al., (2022) also mentioned the readiness of teachers and staff when it comes to alternative work arrangements. This indicates a high level of vocational commitment, where the successful navigation of

complex tasks—such as lesson planning and student support—reinforces a teacher's sense of purpose and efficacy.

Crucially, the study identifies that this resilience is anchored by two critical protective layers: organizational health and student interaction. While **Table 7** highlights that teaching-related demands are a consistent source of stress, **Tables 9** and **10** demonstrate that supportive leadership, collaborative peer relationships, and meaningful connections with students provide the emotional regenerative force necessary to buffer against burnout. Robinson et al. (2023) shared that stress and other related factors can strain mental health exist within multiple layers of an individual's social ecology. Agyapong et al., (2023) also determined that stress and burnout can have a negative impact on teachers and, very often, on the students they teach. The high positive impact of student motivation and classroom relations suggests that the relational core of teaching acts as an existential anchor, transforming potentially overwhelming demands into a form of eustress or productive challenge. This finding somehow supports the recent paper of Riego de Dios and Asio (2026) regarding the motivation and study habits of students. This is further evidenced by **Table 15**, which shows that even stress positively predicts well-being (Bautista et al., 2024), albeit at a lower rate than workload, reinforcing the idea that these teachers view their professional struggles as a necessary component of a meaningful career.

Finally, the inferential analyses in **Tables 11** and **12** reveal a remarkable homogeneity across the teaching force. The lack of significant differences in workload, stress, or well-being based on sex, age, tenure, or educational attainment suggests that these experiences are systemic and structural rather than individual. The "intensification" of teaching appears to be a universal professional reality in this context, affecting novices and veterans with equal intensity. Dreer (2023) stipulated that teacher wellbeing associated with several factors and desirable outcomes like sleep quality, retention, student-teacher relationships and student outcomes. Zhou et al., (2024) highlighted that a teacher's wellbeing was positively influenced by hope, motivation, psychological capital, and competencies. Sohail et al., (2023) also reiterated that a teacher's wellbeing can be impacted by emotional regulation, positive workplace and teacher self-efficacy. For educational managers and policy makers, these results suggest that interventions should not be demographic-specific but should instead focus on institutional reforms. Strategies must prioritize maintaining the healthy organizational climate and protecting the teacher-student bond, while simultaneously finding systemic ways to alleviate the "temporal squeeze" to ensure that the current high levels of well-being are sustainable in the long term.

CONCLUSIONS

The study hereby concluded that a typical teacher-respondent was a married female, aged 41–50, holding a Teacher 1 position with Master's degree units and 11–15 years of experience. The investigation also found that while teachers generally accepted their workload and

acknowledged its associated stress, they still had a positive outlook on their well-being, particularly through student rapport and organizational interaction. Deeper statistical analysis revealed no significant differences in workload, stress, and well-being among teachers when grouped according to their demographic profile. However, the study established significant relationships between workload, stress, and well-being. Linear regression analysis also confirmed that level of workload and level of stress were the primary predictors of a teacher's overall well-being.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The current study has several limitations that future researchers may consider. First, in terms of literature and theoretical background, it would be better to conduct a more robust literature review, focusing on the Job Demands-Resources model. Second, the population and sampling method, since it was only one town, future researchers may include other nearby towns in the province. Since it only covered public elementary schools, future studies can consider expanding it to private institutions as well. Similarly, future studies can also explore secondary school teachers. Third, the instruments used were modified from the previous ones; hence, it would be better if future researchers employed the original ones. Fourth, the study only employed a simple linear regression; hence, multiple linear regression can also be used in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the conclusion of the study, the following are recommended.

- 1) Develop and implement strategies to help teachers manage their workload effectively. This could include providing resources for time management, prioritizing tasks, and reducing non-essential duties. Workshops or training sessions on workload optimization and organizational skills can be beneficial.
- 2) Offer stress management programs and resources to help teachers cope with stress related to teaching demands and loss of social support. Providing access to counseling services, mindfulness training, and stress-reduction techniques can be valuable in supporting teachers' mental health.
- 3) Foster a supportive work environment by promoting peer-to-peer social support structures and encouraging positive interactions among teachers. Establishing mentorship programs, collaborative planning time, and regular feedback mechanisms can help create a sense of community and mutual support.
- 4) Provide opportunities for professional growth and development to enhance teachers' well-being. Offering training in areas such as classroom organization, student interaction strategies, and workload management can contribute to a more positive teaching experience.
- 5) Recognize that certain factors such as civil status, educational attainment, and years of teaching experience may impact teachers' workload, stress levels, and well-being differently.
- 6) Integrate well-being initiatives into school policies and practices to prioritize and promote a culture of well-being among teachers. This could involve incorporating well-being assessments, mental health resources, and support services into the school's overall framework.
- 7) Implement regular monitoring and evaluation systems to assess the impact of interventions on teachers' workload, stress levels, and overall well-being.
- 8) Collect feedback from teachers to identify areas for improvement and make adjustments to support programs as needed.

Tailor support programs and interventions to address the specific needs of different groups based on these factors.

Author contributions: **MBA:** conceptualization, data curation, project administration, writing - original draft, methodology, investigation; **IHC:** conceptualization, formal analysis, methodology, validation, writing - review & editing. All authors approved the final version of the article.

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

Ethical statement: The authors stated that they conducted this research in accordance with recognized ethical standards for research involving human participants. All efforts were made to ensure ethical integrity. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, their participants was purely voluntary, and informed consent was secured. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained all throughout the research process. The study also adheres to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki.

AI declaration: The author stated that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing, or preparation of this manuscript. All content and data analysis presented are the original work of the author.

Declaration of interest: No conflict of interest is declared by the authors.

Data availability: Data generated or analyzed during this study are available upon request from the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

- Agyapong, B., Brett-MacLean, P., Burbach, L., Agyapong, V. I. O., & Wei, Y. (2023). Interventions to reduce stress and burnout among teachers: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(9), Article 5625. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20095625>
- Aquino, J. M. D., Culajara, C. J. J., & Culajara, J. P. M. D. (2023). Examining the work-life balance of teacher-parents in one secondary school in the Philippines: A phenomenological study. *e-Jurnal Penyelidikan dan Inovasi*, 10(2), 158-175.
- Asio, J. M. R. (2021). Determinants of work productivity among selected tertiary education employees: A pre-COVID-19 pandemic analysis. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, 2(1), Article 101455. <https://doi.org/10.33902/IJODS.2021167470>
- Asio, J. M. R., & Jimenez, E. (2021). Implementation of alternative delivery mode learning resources amidst COVID-19 pandemic: Basis for intervention program. *International Journal of Humanities, Management and Social Science*, 4(2), 95-102. <https://doi.org/10.36079/lamintang.ij-humass-0402.293>
- Asio, J. M. R., & Riego de Dios, E. E. (2021). Demographic profiles and procrastination of employees: Relationships and determinants. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 36-45. <https://doi.org/10.20469/ijhss.7.20004-1>

- Asio, J. M. R., & Riego de Dios, E. E. (2019). The college students' perspective on what makes an educator well-qualified. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 3(3), 126-138. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpr.v3i3.124>
- Bautista, M., Apostol, J. N., Malibiran, R., Obispo, K. P., & Asio, J. M. (2024). Emotional state of the pre-service teachers prior to field study: Basis for support and monitoring program. *Formosa Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(3), 907-918. <https://doi.org/10.55927/fjmr.v3i3.7598>
- Carroll, A., Forrest, K., Sanders-O'Connor, E., Flynn, L., Bower, J. M., Fynes-Clinton, S., York, A., & Ziaei, M. (2022). Teacher stress and burnout in Australia: Examining the role of intrapersonal and environmental factors. *Social Psychology of Education*, 25(2-3), 441-469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09686-7>
- Chen, J. J., Li, Z., Rodrigues, W., & Kaufman, S. (2022). Thriving beyond resilience despite stress: A psychometric evaluation of the newly developed Teacher Stress Scale and Teacher Thriving Scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 862342. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.862342>
- Collie, R. J. (2017). Teachers' social and emotional competence: Links with social and emotional learning and positive workplace outcomes. In E. Frydenberg, A. J. Martin, & R. J. Collie (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific: Perspectives, programs and approaches* (pp. 167-184). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3394-0_9
- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., Perry, N. E., & Martin, A. J. (2015). Teacher well-being: Exploring its components and a practice-oriented scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 33(8), 744-756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282915587990>
- Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M., & Hogan, A. (2025). Workload, work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders: A systematic research synthesis. *Educational Review*, 77(2), 661-680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2196607>
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2021). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Dreer, B. (2023). On the outcomes of teacher wellbeing: A systematic review of research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1205179. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1205179>
- Ellovido, B. R. I., & Quirap, E. A. (2024). Teachers' occupational stress and coping mechanisms. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(3), 1266-1275. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-49>
- Garcia, C. D., & Asio, J. M. R. (2023). Stress level and use of coping strategies among nursing students during the pandemic period: Looking back and reflecting its impact. *Journal of Healthcare and Biomedical Science*, 2(1), 35-49. <https://doi.org/10.31098/jhbs.v2i1.1936>
- Maquidato, J. N. C., & Bayani, R. T. (2024). Workload and work engagement among the teachers: A descriptive-correlational study. *EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management*, 11(7), 136-148. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra17756>
- Mendoza, K. J. A., Asio, J. M. R., Abarintos, E. C., & Paguio, D. P. (2022). Readiness of faculty and staff for alternative work arrangements: Implications for a hybrid workforce model. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(10), 1921-1932. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.10.09>
- Mondejar, H. C. U., & Asio, J. M. R. (2022). Human resource management practices and job satisfaction: Basis for development of a teacher retention framework. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(9), 1630-1641. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.04>
- Mat Nang, A. F., Maat, S. M., & Mahmud, M. S. (2022). Teacher technostress and coping mechanisms during COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 12(2), 200-212. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.02.20>
- Nguyen, T. M., & Le, G. N. H. (2021). The influence of COVID-19 stress on psychological well-being among Vietnamese adults: The role of self-compassion and gratitude. *Traumatology*, 27(1), 86-97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000295>
- Orte, C. J. S., Aggari, M. I., Asio, J. M. R., Tanagon, H. D., Matibag, R. S., Berek, P. A., & Bautista, R. A. (2024). Healthy lifestyle behavior practices and professional quality of life of nurses in tertiary hospital. *Indonesian Nursing Journal of Education and Clinic*, 9(1), 74-80. <https://doi.org/10.24990/injec.v9i1.613>
- Pasubillo, M. A. C., & Asio, J. M. R. (2023). Level of satisfaction with the school-based management process: Basis for improved management system. *Journal of Elementary and Secondary School*, 1(2), 29-39. <https://doi.org/10.31098/jess.v1i2.1577>
- Riego de Dios, E., & Asio, J. M. (2026). Students' motivation, self-esteem, and study habits: Interrelationships, variances, and implications. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 32-45. <https://doi.org/10.56916/ijess.v5i1.2894>
- Robinson, L. E., Valido, A., Drescher, A., Woolweaver, A. B., Espelage, D. L., LoMurray, S., Long, A. C. J., Wright, A. A., & Dailey, M. M. (2023). Teachers, stress, and the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative analysis. *School Mental Health*, 15(1), 78-89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-022-09533-2>
- Simbre, A., & Ancho, I. (2023). Post-pandemic aspirations of Filipino elementary school teachers. *Interdisciplinary Research Review*, 18(2), 13-17.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2020). Teacher burnout: Relations between dimensions of burnout, perceived school context, job satisfaction and motivation for teaching: A longitudinal study. *Teachers and Teaching*, 26(7-8), 602-616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1913404>
- Sohail, M. M., Baghdady, A., Choi, J., Huynh, H. V., Whetten, K., & Proeschold-Bell, R. J. (2023). Factors influencing teacher wellbeing and burnout in schools: A scoping review. *Work*, 76(4), 1317-1331. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-220234>
- Wang, Y. (2024). Exploring the impact of workload, organizational support, and work engagement on teachers' psychological wellbeing: A structural equation modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1345740. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1345740>

- Wilson, J. H., & Joye, S. W. (2016). *Research methods and statistics: An integrated approach*. SAGE.
- Zhou, S., Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2024). Factors associated with teacher wellbeing: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36, Article 63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09886-x>

