



WORKLOAD AND WORK ENGAGEMENT AMONG THE TEACHERS: A DESCRIPTIVE-CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Jan Nikkie C. Maquidato¹ Rammel T. Bayani, Edd²

¹Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Administration, Assumption College of Nabunturan

Teacher I Camanlangan National High School, Division of Davao de Oro

²Doctor of Education, Professor, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra17756>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra17756

ABSTRACT

Work engagement is a multifaceted phenomenon that encompasses intrinsic interest, satisfaction, and enjoyment derived from one's work. Work engagement is being challenged by various roots globally not just in the aspects of educational institutions but also in other workplaces. Teaching is undoubtedly one of the most stressful occupations and the most common problem is the work engagement of teachers. Previous studies found that work engagement has profound effects on both individuals and organizations. Engaged employees reported higher job satisfaction, increased well-being, and reduced turnover intentions. Additionally, it is thought to be influenced by motivation and numerous other elements that contribute to job satisfaction, ultimately influencing teacher retention within an educational establishment. This study aimed to determine the level of workload and work engagement of 105 teachers in New Bataan District and identify the relationship between these two variables. This study was conducted with a descriptive-correlational, quantitative, non-experimental research design. The research data were obtained through an adapted questionnaire from 105 public school teachers in New Bataan District, Davao de Oro. The results revealed that the level of teachers' workload is generally high, when perceived with the indicators of duties and obligations, energy, and time. Also, the level of work engagement when perceived with the indicators of vigor and dedication is generally high, however when perceived in terms of absorption it was relatively low. In addition, it was revealed that there is a negative correlation established between the level of teachers' workload and the level of teachers' work engagement. Therefore, work engagement tends to decline with increasing workload.

KEYWORDS: Workload, Work Engagement, Duties and Obligations, Time, Energy, Vigor, Dedication, Absorption, descriptive-correlational, New Bataan

Chapter I INTRODUCTION

The Problem and its Background

Unquestionably, one of the most stressful careers is teaching (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011). Work engagement is the most common problem among teachers (Klassen et al., 2012). Work engagement is being challenged by various roots globally, not just in the aspects of educational institutions but also in other workplaces. Sittar (2020) discovered that teacher performance positively correlates with work engagement in Pakistan. Iyer (2016) also noted that negative personal results, such as decreased work engagement and morale, can lead to significant losses for organizations regarding monetary value and productivity. Similarly, Slišković et al. (2016) observed that increased work engagement among Croatian teachers was linked with higher job enjoyment and reduced exhaustion, particularly to emotional tiredness and alienation.

Abun et al. (2020) found in their study in the Ilocos Region, Philippines, that improving employees' treatment, rights, respect, and relationships at work influences work engagement. Neglecting these aspects can lead to work disengagement and subsequently impact the quality of education. Some factors contribute to work engagement, such



as absorption, dedication, and vigor, positively influencing teaching performance. In Metro Manila, Mingoa (2017) discovered that elementary and high school teachers identify work-related, personal, and financial stressors impacting their work engagement. The most significant stressor teachers report is excessive paperwork, accounting for 52% of their stressors.

At Camanlangan National High School, where the researcher teaches, there is a concerning pattern: many teachers leave their positions at the Department of Education (DepEd) due to excessive tasks. This issue is not unique; there has been a steady increase in teacher resignations across the Davao Region. From 2020 to 2022, 964 teachers left their roles, primarily due to burdensome administrative tasks and non-teaching duties. Davao de Oro Division contributed significantly, with 119 resignations. To understand this trend better, the researcher plans to investigate how teachers' workload affects their engagement levels.

This study focused on teachers' perceptions of their workloads and work engagement, aiming to highlight their relationship. Notably, similar research was lacking in the researcher's municipality, making this study foundational and potentially impactful for teachers and students in public schools. This study focused on teachers' perceptions of their workloads and work engagement, aiming to highlight their relationship. Notably, there was a lack of similar research in the researcher's municipality, making this study foundational and potentially impactful for teachers and students in public schools.

Statement of the Problem

The primary goal of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' workload and work engagement.

Specifically, the researcher sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of teachers' workload when perceived in terms of:
 - 1.1 duties and obligations;
 - 1.2 energy; and
 - 1.3 time?
2. What is the level of the teachers' work engagement in terms of:
 - 2.1 vigor;
 - 2.2 dedication; and
 - 2.3 absorption?
3. Is there a significant relationship between workload and work engagement of teachers?

Chapter II METHODS

This chapter presents the research design, respondents, research instruments, data-gathering procedure, and statistical instruments used to analyze and interpret the gathered data.

Research Design

The researcher used a descriptive-correlational, quantitative, non-experimental research design for this study. It is non-experimental research with a correlation technique since the variables involved in the study were not manipulated or controlled by the researcher but were only studied as they existed.

A quantitative research design is appropriate to provide empirical evidence, as Creswell (2012) described, to answer the posed research questions. The quantitative approach allows the investigation of trends in the research problem and statistical analysis that will test the hypothesis. Moreover, quantitative design is appropriate for data collection and surveys, employing programmed tools that bear statistical data (Creswell, 2012) and examine the differences between the characteristics of the variables (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).

The descriptive nature of the research design is due to its statistical approach. Descriptive research allows for gathering information regarding the relevant aspects of the research topic with no manipulation or control of variables (Arikunto, 2010). For this study, it was meant to study the relationship among the variables. Therefore, it is appropriate to use the correlation method (Arikunto, 2010), wherein their degree of correlation was presented in the form of the correlation coefficient. Creswell (2012) further emphasized that studies that target the description and degree of association between variables should be treated with correlation statistical tests. Specifically, the type of correlation



used in this study is the explanatory design. This is appropriate since the researcher intended to determine the extent to which the variables may change in association with the other.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Camanlangan Elementary School, Camanlangan National High School, La Purisima Elementary School, Magangit Integrated School, Major Angel V. Fajardo National High School, Panag Elementary School, and Tandawan Integrated School in New Bataan District, Division of Davao de Oro.

Camanlangan Elementary School, La Purisima Elementary School, and Panag Elementary School. These elementary schools are in the Barangays of New Bataan, Davao de Oro. Barangay Camanlangan, Fatima and Panag respectively. From Kindergarten through Grade 6, elementary schools normally feature six grades.

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study were the teachers of Camanlangan Elementary School, Camanlangan National High School, La Purisima Elementary School, Magangit Integrated School, Major Angel V. Fajardo National High School, Panag Elementary School, and Tandawan Integrated School in New Bataan District. Only the teaching staff were the respondents of this study. Considering the medium population size in the identified school, the researcher utilized a universal sampling technique.

**Table 1
Respondents of the study**

Name of School	Total No. of Teachers
Camanlangan Elementary School	23
Camanlangan National High School	28
La Purisima Elementary School	8
Magangit Integrated School	13
Major Angel V. Fajardo National High School	8
Panag Elementary School	7
Tandawan Integrated School	18
Total	105

Research Instrument

The research instrument used in the study was a survey questionnaire which dealt with quantitative data about the said phenomenon. The focus of the study was the determination of the amount of association between the variables – workload and work engagement.

An adapted questionnaire was the tool used in this study. The respondents' perception of their workload was assessed using the Reilly Overload Scale, designed by Reilly (1982), which evaluates teachers' workload overload and is used to quantify the construct of workload. It consists of 13 items, with two additional items from the researcher and response options on a Likert scale. This questionnaire is focused on the respondents' experiences and the extent of work that they performed in school.

On the other hand, the questionnaire utilized to assess the work engagement of the teachers is an adapted questionnaire from the work of Schaufeli & Bakker (2004), the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).

A four-point Likert scale was used to elicit responses from the respondents on workload. The following are the scales with the corresponding description: 4 – strongly agree; 3 – agree; 2- disagree; 1- strongly disagree. To measure the level of work engagement, a four-point Likert scale adopted from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) was used: 4 – strongly agree; 3 – agree; 2- disagree; 1- strongly disagree.

Research Procedure

The data were gathered through the following procedures:

Permission to Conduct the Study. The researcher prepared and sent a letter to the School Heads of Camanlangan Central Elementary School, Camanlangan National High School, La Purisima Elementary School, Magangit Integrated School, Major Angel V. Fajardo National High School, Panag Elementary School, and Tandawan



Integrated School seeking permission to conduct a study. Upon approval, the latter is used to gain permission and access to the respondents.

Administration and Retrieval of Questionnaire. The researcher individually administered the survey questionnaire to the study respondents. Before responding to questionnaires, instructions were given to ensure an honest, clear, and thorough response. Each item was described properly so responders could comprehend each question. To confirm that the questionnaire served its objective, the researcher personally retrieved it after completion.

Collation and Tabulation of Data. The responses of the respondents were compiled into a Microsoft Excel file. The combined data were sent to the statistician for proper statistical treatment.

Analysis and Interpretation. The researcher analyzed and interpreted the results based on the aim of the study. The data collection of this study started right after administering the questionnaire to the respondents. After the data collection, it was analyzed using statistical tools to determine the result and after the result was determined, it was interpreted.

Data Analysis

Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess the instrument's internal consistency of items. Nunnally (1978) suggested calculating coefficient alpha (also known as Cronbach Alpha) to determine the reliability of a multiple-item variable. Churchill and Peter (1984) proposed an acceptable level for the alpha coefficient. According to them, alpha values less than 0.60 are undesirable. Meanwhile, Nunnally (1988) stated that newly produced measures can be approved with an alpha value of 0.60; otherwise, the limit should be 0.70.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The responses to the items in the adapted questionnaire were analyzed and interpreted using the appropriate statistical treatment as follows.

Average Mean. This tool was used to determine level of teachers' perceptions of the extent of workload and work engagement.

Pearson-r or Product Moment Correlation. This test was used to determine the extent of association between workload and work engagement.

**Chapter III
RESULTS**

This chapter presents the results obtained from the collected and subsequent analyses in a sequence corresponding to the problems presented. Data and preliminary information were also provided as the basis for the computation and interpretation of the results, which were computed using SPSS software.

Level of Teachers' Workload

Duties and Obligations. Table 2 shows the results of teachers' workload in terms of duties and obligations.

**Table 2
Level of Teachers' Workload in terms of Duties and Obligations**

	Duties and Obligations	Mean	Description
1.	I find myself having to prepare a priority list to get all the things I have to do.	3.36	High
2.	There are times when I cannot meet everyone's expectations.	3.35	High
3.	Many times, I have to cancel commitments outside to meet my work demands.	3.12	High
4.	I seem to have more commitments to overcome than some other teachers I know.	2.82	High
5.	I cannot ever seem to catch up with the work assigned to me.	2.41	Low
	Overall Mean	3.01	High



The workload level for teachers, as viewed in terms of duties and obligations, is displayed in the above table. Item 1, "I find myself having to prepare a priority list to get all the things I have to do," has the highest mean of 3.36 and shows a high level of duties and obligations. Most of the respondents agree that they find themselves preparing a priority list to get all the things they have to do. On the other hand, item 5, "I cannot ever seem to catch up with work assigned to me", has the lowest mean of 2.41 and displays a low level of description; most of the respondents disagree with the statement they cannot ever seem to catch up with work assigned to them. Due to the high degree of duties and obligations, the overall mean for duties and obligations was 3.01.

Energy. It is indicated in Table 3 the results of teachers’ workload in terms of energy.

Table 3
Level of Teachers’ Workload in terms of Energy

Energy	Mean	Description
1. I find it necessary to push myself beyond my typical capacity to ensure the completion of all my tasks.	3.32	High
2. I just cannot find the energy to do all the things expected of me.	2.41	Low
3. I have to do things less carefully in order to get everything done.	2.50	High
4. I feel like my work leaves me mentally fatigued or drained.	2.47	Low
5. I have a number of things to do which I don’t really have enough energy to comply them.	2.79	High
Overall Mean	2.70	High

The workload level for teachers as perceived in terms of energy is displayed in the above table. Item 1, "I find it necessary to push myself beyond my typical capacity to ensure the completion of all my tasks," has the highest mean of 3.32, demonstrating a high-level description of the energy required. The result means that most of the respondents agree that they find it necessary to push themselves beyond their typical capacity to ensure the completion of all their tasks. However, item 2, "I just cannot find the energy to do all the things expected of me," has the lowest mean of 2.41, which demonstrates a low-level description. The result means that they disagree with the statement that they cannot find the energy to do all the things expected of them. A significant amount of energy is indicated by the overall mean of 2.7.

The data indicates that teachers perceive their workload in terms of energy as generally high, with significant demands placed on their physical and mental resources. They often need to push beyond their typical capacity, experiencing feelings of fatigue and inadequacy and sometimes compromising the quality of their work due to limitations in available energy.

Time. Table 4 shows the results of teachers’ workload in terms of time.

Table 4
Level of Teachers’ Workload in terms of Time

Time	Mean	Description
1. I need more hours to do all the things that are expected of me.	3.21	High
2. There are too many demands on my time.	3.01	Low
3. Sometimes, I feel like there are not enough hours in the day for me to complete my tasks.	3.04	High
4. I have things to do which I do not have time for.	2.85	High
5. I do not ever seem to have time for myself.	2.30	Low
Overall Mean	2.88	High

The table above presents teachers' perceptions regarding how much time they spend working. Item 1, "I need more hours to do all the things expected of me," has the highest mean of 3.21, corresponding to a high level of description. Respondents mostly agree that they need more hours to do all the things that are expected of them. Item 2, "There are too many demands on my time," has the lowest mean of 2.3, described as having a low workload perception in terms of time. Respondents disagree with the statement that they always seem to have



little time for themselves. The overall mean for the items, calculated as 2.88, indicates a significant amount of time teachers perceive as consumed by their work-related tasks and responsibilities.

Level of the Teachers’ Work Engagement

Vigor. Table 5 shows the results of teachers’ work engagement in terms of vigor.

Table 5

Level of Teachers’ Work Engagement in terms of Vigor

Vigor	Mean	Description
1. The teacher feels like bursting with energy when working.	2.97	High
2. The teacher feels strong and enthusiastic.	3.22	High
3. The teacher invigorates us by showing that he/she likes to work.	3.12	High
4. The teacher is very resilient mentally and emotionally.	3.16	High
5. The teacher always perseveres even when things do not go well in class.	3.30	High
Overall Mean	3.16	High

The amount of vigor with which teachers participate in their work is displayed in the above table. For items 1 through 5, the corresponding means were 2.97, 3.22, 3.12, 3.16, and 3.3. The statements "The teacher feels like bursting with energy when working, The teacher feels strong and enthusiastic, The teacher invigorates us by showing that they like to work, The teacher is very resilient mentally and emotionally, and The teacher always perseveres even when things do not go well in class" demonstrate a high level of vigor. The total vigor mean of 3.16 describes a high level of vigor.

Dedication. Table 6 shows the results of teachers’ work engagement in terms of dedication.

Table 6

Level of Teachers’ Work Engagement in terms of Dedication

Dedication	Mean	Description
1. The teacher performs his/her job with full meaning and purpose.	3.54	Very High
2. The teacher demonstrates through his/her outputs that teaching is full of meaning and purpose.	3.47	High
3. The teacher continues working for a very long period of time.	3.29	High
4. The teacher is happy teaching to his/her students.	3.54	Very High
5. The teacher is proud of the work that he/she does.	3.56	Very High
Overall Mean	3.48	High

The degree of work engagement and dedication exhibited by teachers is displayed in the above table. For item 2, "The teacher demonstrates through his/her outputs that teaching is full of meaning and purpose," which has the highest mean of 3.56, demonstrates a very high-level description. The result means that the respondents strongly agree that they are proud of their work. Item 3, "The teacher continues working for a very long period of time," has a mean of 3.29. The respondents agree that they continue working for a very long period. A high degree of dedication was indicated by the overall mean of 3.48 for dedication.

Absorption. Table 7 shows the results of teachers' work engagement in absorption.

Table 7

Level of Teachers’ Work Engagement in Terms of Absorption

Absorption	Mean	Description
1. The teacher forgets everything else around him/her.	2.21	Low
2. The teacher gets irritated during a busy time at school.	2.46	Low
3. The teacher does not talk to people when he/she is busy.	2.51	High
4. The teacher feels unhappy when she is working intensely.	2.25	Low
5. The teacher finds it difficult to detach herself/himself from the job.	2.53	High
Overall Mean	2.39	Low



The level of absorption of teacher work engagement is displayed in the above table. Item 3, with the statement "The teacher does not talk to people when he/she is busy", has the highest mean of 2.53, demonstrating a high-level description. This means that respondents agree that they find it difficult to detach themselves from their jobs. On the other hand, item 1, with the statement "The teacher forgets everything else around him/her," has the lowest mean of 2.21, demonstrating a low level of absorption. Respondents disagree that they forget everything else around them. The overall mean of 2.39 indicates that there is a low level of absorption.

A Significant difference between the workload and work engagement among teachers

Table 8 shows the correlation between workload and work engagement among teachers. The correlation was conducted to test whether there is a significant relationship between work engagement and workload.

Table 8
Comparison of the Workload and Work Engagement Among Teachers

Variables	p-value	Correlation coefficient	Remarks
Work Engagement	0.049	-0.186	Significant
Workload			

The P-value of 0.049 is less than 0.05, indicating the relationship is statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and there is a statistically significant relationship. A correlation coefficient of -0.186 indicates a negative correlation between work engagement and workload. The data suggest a negative correlation between work engagement and workload.

Chapter IV
DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the summary of the research study's findings, conclusion, and recommendations. The presentation sequence and the findings' organization were based on the problems presented.

Discussions

Level of Teachers' Workload. Based on the teachers' responses, the workload level is generally high when perceived with the indicators of duties and obligations, energy, and time. The results indicate that teachers face substantial duties and obligations, perceiving their workload as demanding in terms of time and energy. They report a high workload intensity, requiring meticulous planning and often feeling pressured to meet expectations, leading to sacrifices in personal commitments. Teachers also express struggles with energy management, frequently pushing beyond their limits and experiencing fatigue that compromises work quality. Additionally, time constraints emerge as a significant challenge, with teachers grappling with scarcity and the struggle to balance workload demands within available timeframes. Overall, the findings highlight the multifaceted nature of teacher workload, encompassing duties, energy expenditure, and time management challenges.

Teachers expressed the importance of meticulous planning, the challenges associated with meeting expectations, and the necessity of making personal sacrifices. They also observed variations in the perception of workload intensity among their peers. Teachers frequently find themselves compelled to surpass their customary capacities, which often leads to fatigue and self-doubt. Limited energy reserves occasionally result in compromises regarding the quality of their work. Furthermore, teachers perceive time as a significant constraint in their professional lives, as evidenced by a high degree of concurrence regarding statements addressing time scarcity and the difficulty of effectively managing their workload within available time frames.

This study found the same findings as Tarraya (2023), namely, a high level of workload among teachers, and suggested that these heavy workloads significantly impact teacher productivity and general performance. Additionally, considering the critical role that education plays in strengthening the Philippine economy, these issues demand immediate attention to improve the government's resources to enhance accessibility and education quality.

Teachers' workload can affect the different aspects of their duties and responsibilities, changing their effectiveness. Overworked teachers have detrimental consequences on their health and the quality of their instruction, affecting their students' experiences and outcomes (Kyriacou, 2001).



Excessive workload results from several circumstances, including working longer hours and taking on more work than one person is capable of doing. The workload allotted to each task or work also impacts its level of difficulty. Prolonged workload and its effects on psychological shifts in individuals will eventually affect worker productivity through worker fatigue and exhaustion (Wijaya & Prastuti, 2021).

According to David et al. (2019), teachers' tremendous workload and myriad other duties and obligations significantly impacted teaching hours. Teachers are allocated various administrative and ancillary responsibilities, including budgeting, emergency response, health, paperwork, training, and other topics. Teachers were also needed to participate in government projects like medical outreach and campaigns, provisional cash transfers, feeding programs, census, anti-illegal drug programs, and elections, to name a few.

Level of Teachers' Work Engagement. Based on the teachers' responses, the level of work engagement, when perceived with the indicators of vigor and dedication, is generally high. However, when perceived in terms of absorption, it is relatively low. Based on the results, teachers often demonstrate a high level of vigor and dedication in their work; they claim to experience deep views of purpose and commitment over time and feelings of energy, enthusiasm, and emotional resilience. While teachers generally have modest levels of absorption, there are times when they are highly absorbed, such as trying to avoid social engagement or finding it difficult to step away from their work. Though their absorption levels vary depending on the situation, teachers often show high engagement and commitment to their work.

A positive and persistent state of mind is the perfect way to describe work engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). It captures a person's true happiness and sense of fulfillment from their profession and their innate interest in it (Van Beek, Hu, Schaufeli, Taris, & Schreurs, 2012). This complex idea captures a situation in which workers are deeply emotionally invested in their jobs and the organization as a whole and physically present at work (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Recognizing that work engagement is a highly flexible and voluntary condition is crucial (Wildermuth & Pauken, 2008). Engagement results from an individual's innate motives and sense of personal connection to their work, and it cannot be forced or coerced. Moreover, conditions that promote involvement in one worker might not have the same effect on another (Wildermuth & Pauken, 2008). This variation highlights how different every person's experience of work involvement is. Work engagement, although variable, is generally a stable and long-lasting state that endures over time and frequently becomes an integral part of a person's professional identity (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007).

Teachers consistently convey a deep sense of energy, resilience, and passion in their professional roles. This dedication is evident in their unwavering commitment to the meaningfulness and purpose they find in their work, which they maintain over extended periods. Additionally, they derive genuine joy from teaching and take pride in their impact on their profession, fostering a sense of fulfillment and satisfaction.

Kamaruzaman et al. (2022) note that teacher work engagement is believed to impact motivation and numerous other aspects that lead to work satisfaction, ultimately playing a role in teacher retention within an educational institution. There is a strong correlation between teachers' emotional engagement and student accomplishment and between teachers' satisfaction and social engagement and school effectiveness as measured by attendance rates, discipline referrals, and student achievement. It was also discovered that the degree of teacher retention and a teacher's work engagement in social and behavioral aspects were significantly correlated. This suggested that teachers would be more likely to be retained as long as they demonstrated more significant levels of work engagement, particularly in social and behavioral engagement (Gozon & Yango, 2023).

One of the key factors influencing students' academic achievement in the classroom is teachers' work engagement. Passionate teachers on their work are more likely to create an atmosphere that supports the learning and success of their students (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011). Additionally, high levels of teacher engagement foster strong relationships with students, which boosts motivation and performance (Siddique, Khanum, & Haleem, 2022). Teachers who stick to their jobs exhibit high levels of work engagement, meaning the school will be more stable and continuous (Saks, 2006). Ultimately, the mutual relationship between student achievement, teacher



retention, and work engagement by teachers highlights how crucial it is to provide a welcoming and stimulating learning environment.

Correlation between the workload and work engagement among teachers. Using the Pearson correlation, it was revealed that a significant negative correlation was established between the level of teachers' workload and the level of teachers' work engagement. Based on the results, the data shows that work engagement and workload are negatively correlated, suggesting that when work rises, work engagement tends to fall and vice versa.

This study confirms Taipale et al.'s (2011) discovery that a heavy workload could induce workplace stress, causing workers to experience diminished energy levels and mental cohesion. This, in turn, contributed to a decrease in their overall work engagement. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) also arrived at parallel findings, emphasizing that workload negatively affected employees' work engagement.

Furthermore, Malik (2019) stated that work overload results in teacher fatigue and reduced physical and emotional energy. Lengthy teaching periods and a requirement for an ideal environment that the workplace cannot give are a few factors that could lead to exhaustion (Demirel & Cephe, 2015).

On the other hand, this result opposes the findings of Kaiyom et al. (2021) that teachers' workloads may lead to higher engagement at school. Also negated by Breevaart and Bakker (2018), employees remain engaged in the job despite a severe workload and are prepared to face duties and problems at work. Additionally, it contrasts the statement of Salmela-Aro, Hietajarvi, and Lonka (2019) and Zahrah, Aziz, and Hamid (2019) that employees are constantly dedicated to their duties, even when the burden is heavy.

Conclusions

Through this research, it was found that the perceived level of teachers' workload is high. This perception highlights potential challenges in their capacity to fulfill their professional responsibilities effectively. Moreover, a high workload among teachers may affect their job satisfaction, well-being, and effectiveness in delivering quality education to students

The teachers' work engagement level from the survey expresses that the teachers' responses in this study suggest a complex perspective on work engagement. While the levels of engagement are generally high when perceived through the indicators of vigor and dedication, there appears to be a relatively lower level of engagement when viewed in absorption. This disparity emphasizes the importance of considering multiple facets of work engagement when assessing the overall engagement levels of teachers. Furthermore, it prompts further inquiry into the factors contributing to this variation, including workload, job demands, organizational culture, and individual teacher differences.

Overall, the research reveals a negative correlation between workload and work engagement, meaning that work engagement tends to decline with increasing workload. However, this relationship's strength is comparatively low. Although there appears to be a tendency to link more workloads to lower work engagement levels, it is vital to remember that this relationship could be more robust. Individuals' work engagement levels are significantly influenced by factors other than workload. As a result, while workload is a factor to be considered, it is not the only one; other factors should also be considered when assessing and addressing work engagement in the workplace.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions derived from the findings of the study, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. Educational institutions should create and put into practice efficient workload management systems. This could imply offering instruments for workload distribution, time management instructions, and task prioritizing.
2. Create a supportive work environment that values teachers' well-being and provides adequate support.
3. Offering professional growth and development opportunities can increase teachers' sense of fulfillment and engagement in their work.
4. Conduct longitudinal studies to examine the dynamic nature of work engagement and its relationship with workload over time.



REFERENCES

1. Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Lalaine, S., & Encarnacion, M. G. (2020). *Employees' workplace well-being and work engagement of divine word colleges' employees in Ilocos region, Philippines*. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN BUSINESS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE*, 9(2), 70-84.
2. Ali, S., & Farooqi, Y. (2014). *Effect of Work Overload on Job Satisfaction, Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance and Employee Engagement (A Case of Public Sector University of Gujranwala Division)*. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING*, VOL. 5, NO. 8.
3. Anila, K., & Venkatachalam, K. (2016). *Study on the Work Life Balance: Womens' Perspective*. *International Research Journal of Business and Management*, IX(12):30-34.
4. Arikunto, S. (2010). *Research Procedure: A Practical Approach*. Jakarta: Rineka.
5. Bakker, A. B. (2018). *Job crafting among health care professionals: The role of work engagement*. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 321-331.
6. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). *Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward*. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Volume 22, Issue No. 3, 273–285.
7. Bautista, R. G., & Cariño, N. D. (2015). *Work Engagement Behaviors as Correlates of Employee Performance*. *CVCITC Research Journal*, 2 (1), 1 –11.
8. Bongco, R. T., & Ancho, I. V. (2019). *Exploring Filipino Teachers' Professional Workload*. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 19-29.
9. Breevaart, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). *Daily job demands and employee work engagement: The role of daily transformational leadership behavior*. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(3), 338–349.
10. Brunetti, G. J. (2006). *Resilience under fire: Perspectives on the work of experienced, inner city high school teachers in the United States*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(7), 812–825.
11. Colacion-Quiros, H., & Gemora, R. B. (2016). *Causes and Effects of Stress Among Faculty Members in a State University*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(1), 18-27.
12. Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). *Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 95, Issue 5, 834–848.
13. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Qualitative Research (4th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
14. David, C. C., Albert, J. G., & Vizmanos, J. V. (2019). *Pressures on public school teachers and implications on quality*. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*, 1-6.
15. Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2013). *Resilient Teachers, Resilient Schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times*. New York: Routledge.
16. Day, C., Sammons, P., Stobart, G., Kington, A., & Gu, Q. (2007). *Teachers Matter: Connecting Lives, Work and Effectiveness*. McGraw Hill.
17. Demirel, E., & Cephe, P. (2015). *Looking Into Burnout Levels Among English Language Instructors*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1-14.
18. DepEd. (2013). *K to 12 Curriculum Guide for Mother Tongue*. Philippines: Department of Education.
19. DepEd. (2021). *K to 12 Basic Education Program End of School Year 2021-2022 Graduation Message*. Philippines: Department of Education.
20. Dibbon, D. (2004). *It's About Time: A Report on the Impact of Workload*.
21. Dobrydney, T. (2023, May 1). *The Power of Engagement: How Motivation, Purpose, and Workplace Conditions Drive Success*. Retrieved from The Performance Institute: <https://www.performanceinstitute.org/blog/the-power-of-engagement-how-motivation-purpose-and-workplace-conditions-drive-success>
22. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). *The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions*. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432.
23. Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). *Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship*. *Computers & Education*, 59(2), 423-435.
24. Ertürk, R. (2022). *The Effect of Teachers' Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions*. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 9(1), 191-203.
25. García-Arroyo, J. A., & Segovia, A. O. (2019). *Work Overload and Emotional Exhaustion in University Teachers: Moderating Effects of Coping Styles*. *Potificia Universidad Javeriana*, Volume 18 No. 2.
26. Gourault, K. (2023, May 4). *The Impact of Student-Teacher Ratios on Learning: Exploring the Optimal Class Size*. Texas, United States of America: *Educational Research and Innovation (ERI)*.
27. Gozon, J. P., & Yango, A. R. (2023). *Teachers' Work Engagement, School Performance, and Teachers' Retention in Selected Private Schools in the City Schools Division of Santa Rosa, Laguna*. *Technium Social Science Journal*, Vol. 44, 360-383.



28. Greenberg, M. T. (2006). *Promoting Resilience in Children and Youth: Preventive Interventions and Their Interface with Neuroscience*. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, 1094, 139-150.
29. Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2007). *Teachers resilience: A necessary condition for effectiveness*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Volume 23, Issue 8, 1302-1316.
30. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). *Burnout and work engagement among teachers*. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495-513.
31. Hancock, D. R., & Betts, S. C. (2017). *Teachers' perspectives on differentiation of instruction*. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 110(3), 236-245.
32. Hargreaves, A. (2000). *Mixed emotions: Teachers' perceptions of their interactions with students*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(8), 811-826.
33. Harter, J. (2018, August 26). *Employee Engagement on the Rise in the U.S.* Retrieved from Gallup: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/241649/employee-engagement-rise.aspx>
34. Hernando-Malipot, M. (2018, August 15). *DepEd urged to reduce teachers' workload*. *Manila Bulletin*.
35. Hosain, S. (2016). *Teaching Workload and Performance: An Empirical Analysis on Some Selected Private Universities of Bangladesh*. *International Journal of English and Education*, Volume: 5, Issue: 3.
36. Huyghebaert, T., Gillet, N., Beltou, N., Tellier, F., & Fouquereau, E. (2018). *Effects of workload on teachers' functioning: A moderated mediation model including sleeping problems and overcommitment*. *Stress and Health*, 34, 601-611.
37. Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. A. (2011). *The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research*. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.
38. Iyer, R. D. (2016). *A Study of Work Engagement among Teachers in*. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1.
39. Jerrim, J., & Sims, S. (2021). *When is high workload bad for teacher wellbeing? Accounting for the non-linear contribution of specific teaching tasks*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Volume 105, 103395.
40. Johari, J., Yean Tan, F., & Zulkarnain, Z. I. (2018). *Autonomy, Workload, Work-Life Balance and Job Performance among Teachers*. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(1), 107-120.
41. Jomoad, P. D., Antiquina, M. M., Cericos, E. U., Bacus, J. A., Vallejo, J. H., Dionio, B. B., ... Clarin, A. S. (2021). *Teachers' workload in relation to burnout and work performance*. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, Vol.8 (2), pp. 48-53 .
42. Kaiyom, S. A., Rahman, R. A., & Mustaffa, W. W. (2021). *The Effect of Workload, Supervisor Support and Co-Workers*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(8), 1633-1647.
43. Kamaruzaman, M., Surat, S., & Mydin, F. (2022). *Teachers Work Engagement During Covid-19*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 112-119.
44. Kanwal, A., Rafiq, S., & Afzal, A. (2023). *IMPACT OF WORKLOAD ON TEACHERS' EFFICIENCY AND THEIR STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL*. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, Vol 39 No 2.
45. Klassen, R. M., Aldhafri, S., Mansfield, C. F., Siu, A. F., Wong, M. W., & Woods-McConney, A. (2012). *Teachers' Engagement at Work: An International Validation Study*. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 317-337.
46. Kyriacou, C. (2001). *Teacher stress: Directions for future research*. *Educational Review*, 53(1), 27-35.
47. Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (11th ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited.
48. Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2004). *Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout*. *American Psychological Association*, 91-134.
49. Llorens, S., Schaufeli, W., Bakker, A., & Salanova, M. (2007). *Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? Computers in Human Behavior*, Volume 23, Issue 1, 825-841.
50. Lukito, L., & Alriani, I. (2018). *PENGARUH BEBAN KERJA, LINGKUNGAN KERJA, STRES KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN PADA PT. SINARMAS DISTRIBUSI NUSANTARA SEMARANG*. *JURNAL EKONOMI MANAJEMEN AKUNTANSI*, Vol. 25, No. 45.
51. Malau, T. S., & Kasmir, K. (2021). *EFFECT OF WORKLOAD AND WORK DISCIPLINE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE OF PT. XX WITH JOB SATISFACTION AS INTERVENING VARIABLE*. *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management*, Volume 2, Issue 5.
52. Malik, N. (2019). *Occupational Stress and Burnout among University Teachers in Pakistan and Finland*. *Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press*.
53. Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., & Broadley, T. (2016). *Building resilience in teacher education: An evidenced informed framework*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 54, 77-87.
54. Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2007). *Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: A longitudinal study*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Volume 70, Issue 1, 149-171.
55. McGrath-Champ, S., Wilson, R., & Stacey, M. (2017). *Teaching & Learning: Review of Workload*. *Sydney: University of Sydney*.



56. Milman, N. B. (2012). *Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and their use of technology*. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 44(4), 349-367.
57. Mingo, T. R. (2017). *Filipino Teachers' Stress Levels and Coping Strategies*. DLSU Research Congress 2017.
58. Nixon, A. E., Mazzola, J. J., Bauer, J., Krueger, J. R., & Spector, P. E. (2011). *Can work make you sick? A meta-analysis of the relationships between job stressors and physical symptoms*. *An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, 1-22.
59. OECD. (2009). *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS*. Paris.
60. OECD. (2019). *Teachers' well-being: A crucial but overlooked contributor to quality education*. OECD Publishing.
61. Rajan, D. (2018). *Negative impacts of heavy workload: a comparative study among sanitary workers*. *Sociology International Journal*, 2(6):465-474.
62. Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). *The Influence of Affective Teacher-Student Relationships on Students' School Engagement and Achievement: A Meta-Analytic Approach*. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(4), 493-529.
63. Saks, A. M. (2006). *Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
64. Salmela-Aro, K., Hietajärvi, L., & Lonka, K. (2019). *Work Burnout and Engagement Profiles Among Teachers*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, Volume 10.
65. Sandmeier, A., Baeriswyl, S., Krause, A., & Muehlhausen, J. (2022). *Work until you drop: Effects of work overload, prolonging working hours, and autonomy need satisfaction on exhaustion in teachers*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Volume 118, 103843.
66. Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). *Work engagement in Europe: Relations with National Economy, Governance and Culture*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 99-106.
67. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). *Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
68. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., & González-Romá, V. (2002). *The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach*. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
69. Serdyukov, P. (2017). *Innovation in education: what works, what doesn't, and what to do about it?* *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 4-33.
70. Siddique, A., Khanum, B., & Haleem, B. (2022). *Work Engagement and Job Performance of Teachers: A Correlational Study*. *Global Educational Studies Review*, VII(1), 502-516.
71. Sittar, K. (2020). *Relationship of Work Engagements and Job Performance of University Teachers*. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, Vol. 42, No. 1 pp. 167-183.
72. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). *Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1029-1038.
73. Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). *Teacher Stress and Teacher Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Engagement, Emotional Exhaustion, and Motivation to Leave Teaching Profession*. *Creative Education*, Volume 7: 1785-1799.
74. Skinner, E., Pitzer, J., & Brule, H. (2014). *The role of emotion in engagement, coping, and the development of motivational resilience*. In R. Pekrun, & L. Linnenbrink-Garcia, *International Handbook of Emotions in Education* (pp. 331-347.). New York: Routledge.
75. Slišković, A., Burić, I., & Knežević, I. (2016). *Job Satisfaction and Job Burnout Among Teachers: the Importance of Principal's Support and Work Motivation*. *Social Research: Journal of General Social Issues*, Vol. 25 No. 3, 371-392.
76. Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2012). *Beyond workaholism: Towards a general model of heavy work investment*. *Human Resource Management Review*, Volume 22, Issue 3, 232-243.
77. Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. (2010). *Staying Well and Engaged When Demands Are High: The Role of Psychological Detachment*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5); 965-976.
78. Spagnoli, P., Haynes, N. J., Kovalchuk, L. S., Clark, M. A., Buono, C., & Balducci, C. (2020). *Workload, Workaholism, and Job Performance: Uncovering Their Complex Relationship*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6536.
79. Sugden, N. A. (2010). *Teacher Workload: A Formula for Maximizing Teacher Performance and Well-Being*. Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America.
80. Taipale, S., Selander, K., Anttila, T., & Nätti, J. (2011). *Work engagement in eight European countries : the role of job demands, autonomy, and social support*. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, , Volume 31, Issue 7/8, 486-504.
81. Tancinco, N. P. (2016). *Status of Teachers' Workload and Performance in State Universities of Eastern Visayas: Implications for Educational Management*. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, Volume 18, Issue 6 .Ver. IV, 46-57.
82. Tarraya, H. O. (2023). *Teachers' Workload Policy: Its Impact on Philippine Public School Teachers*. *International Journal of Computing Sciences Research*, Volume 4.



83. Thompson, M. (2021, October 22). *Employee Engagement Models and Theories*. Retrieved from wethrive: [https://wethrive.net/employee-engagement/engagement-models-theories/#:~:text=The%20AON%2DHewitt%20model%20of,most%20control\)%20and%20three%20outcomes.](https://wethrive.net/employee-engagement/engagement-models-theories/#:~:text=The%20AON%2DHewitt%20model%20of,most%20control)%20and%20three%20outcomes.)
84. Ulla, M. B., Barrera, K. B., & Acompañado, M. M. (2017). *Philippine Classroom Teachers as Researchers: Teachers' Perceptions, Motivations, and Challenges*. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 42; Issue no. 11.
85. VanBreda, A. D. (2001). *Resilience Theory: A Literature Review*. Pretoria.
86. Villarejo, F. B., Mamburao, R. S., & Lumapenet, H. T. (2022). *Work Demands and Occupational Burnout Among Public School Teachers in the Philippines*. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, Volume 8; Issue no. 3.
87. Wang, Y. (2021). *Building Teachers' Resilience: Practical Applications for Teacher Education of China*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, Volume 12.
88. 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*.
89. Wang, Y., Derakhshan, A., & Rahimpour, H. (2022). *Developing resilience among Chinese and Iranian EFL teachers: A multi-dimensional cross-cultural study*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-18.
90. Wijaya, B., & Prastuti, E. (2021). *The Contribution of Workload and Stress towards Burnout in Special Needs Teachers*. *KnE Social Sciences*, 263-283.
91. Wildermuth, C., & Pauken, P. D. (2008). *A perfect match: decoding employee engagement – Part I: Engaging cultures and leaders*. *Industrial and Commercial*
92. Zahrah, N., Aziz, A., & Hamid, S. A. (2019). *Workload and Work Engagement among Nurses in Public Hospitals: Moderating Role of Religious Spirituality*. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 297-312.