

Occupational Stress and Burnout among Teachers in a Private Basic Education Center in Northern Luzon

Rhency Joi A. Caramancion¹ , John Noel E. Fermin² 

Author Information:

¹ Graduate School, University of La Salette, Inc., Santiago City, Isabela 3311, Philippines

² Human Resource Management Office, University of La Salette, Inc., Santiago City, Isabela 3311, Philippines

Correspondence:

caramancionrhency@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: August 3, 2026

Date Revised: August 11, 2026

Date Accepted: August 11, 2026

Date Published: September 06, 2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0383>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0383

Recommended Citation:

Caramancion, R. J. A., & Fermin, J. N. E. (2026). Occupational stress and burnout among teachers in a private basic education center in Northern Luzon. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(7), 553-569. <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0383>

Abstract. Teacher occupational stress and burnout remain concerns because sustained work demands may affect educators' well-being and professional functioning. This study assessed occupational stress and burnout among full-time teachers in a private basic education center in Northern Luzon and examined differences across selected demographic characteristics. A quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive-comparative design was employed using total enumeration. All 52 eligible teachers participated, yielding a 100% participation rate. Data were collected using the Teacher Stress Inventory and the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey and analyzed through descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U tests, and Kruskal-Wallis H tests at the .05 significance level. The teachers generally reported mild occupational stress, with time management, discipline and motivation, fatigue manifestations, and work-related stressors emerging as the more evident concerns. Burnout findings reflected periodic emotional exhaustion, relatively infrequent depersonalization, and a sustained sense of personal accomplishment. Occupational stress did not significantly differ according to sex, age, educational attainment, marital status, or combined family income. A statistically significant difference was observed only in professional investment according to length of service, with teachers who had three to five years of service reporting greater stress than those with zero to two years. No significant demographic differences were found across the burnout dimensions. Given the numerous inferential comparisons and unequal subgroup sizes, demographic findings warrant cautious interpretation. The results provide an institution-specific basis for prioritizing support in workload and time management, classroom-management demands, fatigue, emotional wellness, and professional development. The proposed guidance intervention program should be regarded as an evidence-informed institutional strategy requiring pilot implementation and evaluation before its effectiveness can be established.

Keywords: guidance intervention program; occupational stress; private basic education; teacher burnout; teacher well-being

Introduction

Teaching requires sustained intellectual, emotional, and interpersonal engagement. Beyond classroom instruction, teachers plan lessons, assess learning, manage student behavior, respond to diverse learner needs, communicate with parents, and fulfill institutional responsibilities. When these demands accumulate or are perceived to exceed available time, resources, and support, they may contribute to occupational strain. Consequently, teacher stress and burnout remain important concerns because they may affect educators' well-being, work engagement, and professional functioning (Agyapong et al., 2022; Westphal et al., 2022).

Occupational stress and burnout are related but conceptually distinct occupational experiences. Occupational stress refers to psychological, emotional, behavioral, or physiological strain associated with perceived workplace demands, whereas burnout represents a more enduring work-related condition characterized by emotional exhaustion, psychological distancing from work, and reduced professional efficacy (Maslach et al., 1996; World Health Organization, 2019). Experiencing occupational stress, therefore, does not necessarily indicate that burnout is already present. This distinction is important because teachers may experience particular sources or manifestations of stress without demonstrating a pronounced burnout pattern.

Examining both constructs within the same teacher population can provide a more differentiated picture of occupational well-being than assessing either construct independently. Occupational stress identifies the work-related pressures and manifestations currently experienced by teachers, while burnout

reflects patterns of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and perceived professional accomplishment. Considering both constructs allows researchers to determine whether teachers reported occupational strain is accompanied by broader signs of professional depletion or whether stress remains comparatively limited to particular aspects of their work. Such an approach supports a more precise interpretation of teachers' occupational experiences without assuming a causal relationship between stress and burnout.

The relevance of these experiences extends beyond individual employee welfare. Teacher burnout has been associated with less favorable student and instructional outcomes, including lower student achievement and motivation (Madigan & Kim, 2021). Emotional demands, difficulties in regulating occupational strain, workload pressures, organizational expectations, and inadequate support have likewise been identified as factors relevant to teachers' professional well-being (Agyapong et al., 2022; Brandão et al., 2025). Understanding teachers' occupational experiences is therefore important not only for supporting personnel but also for maintaining effective classroom relationships, instructional continuity, and institutional functioning.

Although teacher stress and burnout have been widely investigated, findings cannot be assumed to apply uniformly across educational settings. Schools differ in workload arrangements, organizational structures, employment conditions, student populations, administrative expectations, and available support systems. These contextual differences are particularly relevant when institutional interventions are being developed. However, the value of studying occupational stress and burnout in a specific school extends beyond identifying local program needs. By examining the two constructs simultaneously, the study provides an integrated occupational profile that distinguishes immediate or domain-specific stress experiences from broader manifestations of burnout. This distinction may help clarify which aspects of teacher well-being appear situational and which may warrant more sustained institutional attention.

The present study therefore examines occupational stress and burnout among teachers in a private basic education center in Northern Luzon. It determines the levels and dimensions of both constructs, examines whether these vary across selected demographic characteristics, and uses the resulting evidence as the basis for developing a guidance intervention program responsive to teachers identified needs.

Research Questions

The study aims to assess occupational stress and burnout among teachers in a private basic education center in Northern Luzon and examine their differences across selected demographic characteristics. The findings will serve as the basis for developing a guidance intervention program intended to address the teachers' identified needs. The study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 sex;
 - 1.2 age;
 - 1.3 length of service;
 - 1.4 educational attainment;
 - 1.5 marital status; and
 - 1.6 combined family income?
2. What is the level of occupational stress experienced by the respondents in terms of:
 - 2.1 time management;
 - 2.2 workplace stressors;
 - 2.3 professional distress;
 - 2.4 discipline and motivation;
 - 2.5 professional investment;
 - 2.6 emotional manifestations;
 - 2.7 fatigue manifestations;
 - 2.8 cardiovascular manifestations;
 - 2.9 gastronomical manifestations; and
 - 2.10 behavioral manifestations?
3. What is the frequency of burnout experienced by the respondents in terms of:
 - 3.1 emotional exhaustion;
 - 3.2 depersonalization; and
 - 3.3 personal accomplishment?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference in the teachers' level of occupational stress when they are grouped according to their demographic characteristics?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference in the teachers' frequency of burnout when they are grouped according to their demographic characteristics?

6. Based on the results, what guidance intervention program can be developed to address the teachers' stress and burnout?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study focuses on occupational stress and burnout among full time teachers in one private basic education center in Northern Luzon. Total enumeration was used to include all eligible teachers. Occupational stress was examined through time management, workplace stressors, professional distress, discipline and motivation, professional investment, and emotional, fatigue, cardiovascular, gastronomical, and behavioral manifestations. Burnout was assessed through emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Differences were also examined according to sex, age, length of service, educational attainment, marital status, and combined family income. The study is limited to the teachers of the selected institution and reflects only their reported experiences during the period of data collection. It does not establish causal relationships, identify predictors, or provide clinical diagnoses. Other possible factors related to stress and burnout were not included. Therefore, the findings should not be generalized to all teachers or private schools in Northern Luzon. The proposed guidance intervention program is limited to development and is not implemented or evaluated in the study.

Literature Review

Occupational Stress among Teachers

Occupational stress among teachers develops from the interaction between workplace demands and the resources available to address them. Teaching involves instructional preparation, assessment, classroom management, communication with parents, administrative documentation, and participation in school activities. Across different educational contexts, workload, time pressure, student behavior, role conflict, limited resources, and inadequate organizational support have consistently been associated with teacher stress (Agyapong et al., 2022; Carroll et al., 2022; Westphal et al., 2022). These findings suggest that occupational stress is not attributable to a single demand but to the cumulative experience of professional responsibilities and the adequacy of available support.

Teacher stress may be understood through both its sources and manifestations. Fimian (1984) and Fimian and Fastenau (1990) identified time management, workplace stressors, professional distress, discipline and motivation, and professional investment as important sources of stress, while emotional, fatigue, cardiovascular, gastronomical, and behavioral manifestations indicate how occupational strain may be experienced. This distinction is relevant because teachers may report difficulty with particular work demands without exhibiting the same degree of emotional, physical, or behavioral response.

Empirical findings support this multidimensional interpretation. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017) found that time pressure was strongly associated with emotional exhaustion, while discipline problems and low student motivation were related to several burnout dimensions. Similarly, Aloe et al. (2014b) reported that student misbehavior was associated with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lower personal accomplishment, although the strength of these relationships differed across dimensions. In contrast, Bottiani et al. (2019) emphasized the protective role of professional resources, including self-efficacy and positive collegial relationships.

The COVID-19 pandemic intensified established stressors through technological demands, instructional uncertainty, and disrupted work and personal boundaries. Westphal et al. (2022), however, showed that leadership, organizational conditions, self-efficacy, and technological preparation also influenced teachers' experiences. Comparable patterns were reported outside pandemic conditions. Carroll et al. (2022) identified workload, difficulties in emotion regulation, and lower subjective wellbeing as contributors to stress and burnout among Australian teachers, with early career teachers experiencing greater difficulties. Thus, although specific stressors differ across contexts, the balance between demands and available resources remains a recurring consideration.

Philippine studies demonstrate similar concerns but also show contextual variation. Cammayo et al. (2022) documented stress and burnout among Filipino teachers during remote learning, while Magtalas and Eduvala (2024) reported a strong positive relationship between work and role overload and burnout among public elementary school teachers. In private education, Lleve et al. (2024) found moderate internal and external job stress among high school teachers and identified differences associated with years of service, employment status, sex, and monthly salary in selected stress indicators. These findings converge on the relevance of workload and professional demands, but differences in school setting, instructional conditions, measurement, and respondent characteristics caution against direct generalization.

Burnout among Teachers and Its Dimensions

Burnout is related to occupational stress but represents a distinct occupational experience. Maslach and Jackson (1981) conceptualized burnout through emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion reflects depletion of emotional resources, depersonalization involves psychological distancing or impersonal responses toward others at work, and personal accomplishment concerns perceptions of professional competence and effectiveness.

Research consistently identifies emotional exhaustion as particularly responsive to quantitative work demands. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017) associated time pressure with emotional exhaustion, while discipline problems, low student motivation, and value dissonance were more broadly related to depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Aloe et al. (2014a) found that stronger classroom management self-efficacy was associated with lower emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and greater personal accomplishment. Bottiani et al. (2019) similarly demonstrated the value of professional and relational resources in reducing teachers' stress and burnout. These findings converge in suggesting that burnout reflects the interaction between demanding occupational conditions and the resources available to teachers.

Burnout may also have implications beyond the teacher. Madigan and Kim (2021) found that teacher burnout was associated with poorer student academic achievement and less favorable student reported outcomes, particularly motivation. Although the present study does not examine student outcomes, this evidence reinforces the institutional relevance of understanding teacher burnout.

Philippine research, however, reports varying burnout levels. Pabatang et al. (2022) found generally low emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal achievement among a small group of tertiary teachers during the pandemic, despite reports of excessive workload, overlapping responsibilities, meetings, and nonteaching tasks. In contrast, Magtalas and Eduvala (2024) identified more substantial burnout concerns among public elementary school teachers in relation to work and role overload. Gamalo and Abellana (2025) likewise demonstrated the relevance of workload, behavioral management, and professional burnout among teachers in Malaybalay City. In Northern Luzon, Guillermo (2024) reported an average level of burnout among public secondary school teachers in Burgos, Isabela, particularly in exhaustion and disengagement, but found no significant demographic differences.

These findings demonstrate both convergence and divergence. Workload and professional responsibilities repeatedly emerge as relevant conditions, yet reported burnout levels vary across populations and settings. Differences in school type, instructional level, measurement instruments, working conditions, and study period may partly explain these variations. Consequently, burnout levels reported in public schools, tertiary institutions, or other regions cannot be assumed to characterize teachers in the selected private basic education center.

Relationship between Occupational Stress and Burnout

Occupational stress and burnout are conceptually connected but should not be used interchangeably. Stress may occur in response to immediate or continuing demands, whereas burnout reflects a more sustained pattern of emotional exhaustion, psychological distancing, and changes in professional accomplishment. A teacher may therefore experience occupational stress without developing a pronounced burnout pattern.

The Job Demands–Resources Model provides a useful framework for understanding this distinction. Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2017) explain that persistent job demands require sustained physical, cognitive, or emotional effort and may contribute to strain, particularly when adequate resources are unavailable. Conversely, resources such as autonomy, supportive leadership, collegial relationships, constructive feedback, professional development, and adequate materials may reduce the adverse effects of demands and support motivation.

Evidence among teachers is consistent with this explanation. Workload, time pressure, student misbehavior, and professional conflict have been associated with stress and burnout, while self-efficacy, collegial support, positive leadership, and organizational resources appear to provide protection (Aloe et al., 2014a, 2014b; Bottiani et al., 2019; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). Thus, occupational stress should not be interpreted as inevitably progressing to burnout.

Demographic Characteristics and Differences in Stress and Burnout

Research concerning demographic differences in stress and burnout has produced inconsistent findings. Sex, age, length of service, educational attainment, marital status, and economic circumstances may correspond with differences in occupational experiences, but these characteristics should not be interpreted as direct causes of stress or burnout.

Purvanova and Muros (2010) found that women reported slightly greater emotional exhaustion, while men reported slightly greater depersonalization; however, the differences were small. This cautions against broad assumptions regarding sex-based vulnerability. Local evidence is similarly mixed. Lleve et al.



(2024) identified sex related differences in selected forms of stress, whereas Guillermo (2024) found no significant demographic differences in burnout. Such divergence suggests that sex related patterns may depend on occupational roles, expectations, or institutional conditions.

Age and length of service also show inconsistent associations. Brewer and Shapard (2004) reported small negative relationships between age, work experience, and emotional exhaustion, while Carroll et al. (2022) observed greater difficulties among early career teachers. However, longer service may also involve accumulated responsibilities or prolonged exposure to occupational demands. Length of service is therefore more appropriately treated as a contextual characteristic than as a direct determinant of stress or burnout.

Evidence regarding educational attainment, marital status, and economic circumstances is likewise limited. Pabatang et al. (2022) reported differences in selected burnout dimensions according to sex and educational attainment, although their small tertiary level sample limits broader interpretation. Agyapong et al. (2022) identified marital status among demographic factors examined in teacher stress and burnout research, but findings do not establish a consistent protective or risk pattern. Similarly, Lleve et al. (2024) found an association between monthly salary and external job stress, although monthly salary differs conceptually from combined family income. Overall, demographic findings vary considerably across studies. Lleve et al. (2024) reported differences involving sex, salary, employment status, and years of service; Pabatang et al. (2022) identified differences in selected burnout dimensions; and Guillermo (2024) reported no significant demographic differences in burnout. These mixed findings justify examining demographic group differences within the selected institution but do not support assumptions that particular demographic groups will necessarily experience greater occupational stress or burnout.

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive–comparative design. It described the teachers' occupational stress and burnout and examined whether these differed across selected demographic groups. No variables were manipulated, and the study did not attempt to establish causal or predictive relationships. The findings were used as the empirical basis for developing a proposed guidance intervention program.

Sampling Design

Total enumeration was employed because the accessible population consisted of 52 full-time teachers who met the eligibility criteria. All 52 eligible teachers were invited to participate, and all voluntarily participated and provided usable responses for analysis, yielding a 100% participation and usable-response rate.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in a private basic education center in Northern Luzon, Philippines. The institution was selected because it was the intended setting and beneficiary of the proposed guidance intervention program. Its name was withheld in the manuscript to protect institutional confidentiality.

Research Participants

The participants consisted of 52 full-time teachers assigned to different grade levels during School Year 2025–2026. Eligibility was limited to teachers who were actively employed during the data-collection period and who voluntarily provided informed consent. Part-time personnel, nonteaching employees, and teachers who were not actively reporting for work during the study period were excluded. Although total enumeration ensured representation of the entire eligible teaching population of the institution, some demographic categories contained small and substantially unequal subgroup sizes. Consequently, inferential comparisons involving these subgroups were interpreted cautiously because small or uneven groups may reduce statistical power and the stability of group comparisons. This limitation was considered particularly when interpreting statistically significant and nonsignificant demographic differences.

Research Instruments

Data were collected using a demographic questionnaire and two standardized self-report instruments. The demographic questionnaire obtained information on sex, age, length of service, educational attainment, marital status, and combined family income. Occupational stress was assessed using the 49-item Teacher Stress Inventory. It covers five stress-source domains—time management, work-related stressors, professional distress, discipline and motivation, and professional investment—and five stress-manifestation domains: emotional, fatigue, cardiovascular, gastronomic, and behavioral manifestations. Responses are

rated from 1, indicating no strength or a condition that is not noticeable, to 5, indicating major strength or a condition that is extremely noticeable. Item responses were averaged within each domain, while the overall occupational stress score was obtained by averaging the ten domain scores. Higher scores indicated greater occupational stress (Fimian, 1984; Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Burnout was assessed using the 22-item Maslach Burnout Inventory–Educators Survey (MBI–ES), which measures emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Responses are rated on a seven-point frequency scale ranging from 0, never, to 6, every day. Items were scored separately for the three dimensions in accordance with the instrument manual. Higher emotional exhaustion and depersonalization scores indicated greater burnout, whereas lower personal accomplishment scores reflected a more concerning burnout pattern. No combined overall burnout score was computed because the three dimensions have different conceptual meanings and directions of interpretation (Maslach et al., 2018). The instruments were administered in their original English versions without modification. The Teacher Stress Inventory has demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .77 to .90 across its subscales and from .91 to .94 for the overall scale (Fimian, 1986). The Maslach Burnout Inventory–Educators Survey has likewise demonstrated acceptable to strong internal consistency, with previously reported coefficients of $\alpha = .90$ for emotional exhaustion, $\alpha = .79$ for depersonalization, and $\alpha = .71$ for personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In addition to these published estimates, sample-specific Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for the occupational stress domains and overall scale and separately for the three burnout dimensions. These coefficients are reported prominently in the Results to establish the internal consistency of the measures within the present sample.

Data-Gathering Procedure

Ethical and administrative approval was obtained from the University Research Ethics Committee and the school administration before data collection. Data were gathered from March to May 2026 through paper-based administration. The teachers received an explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, voluntary nature, possible discomforts, and confidentiality safeguards before providing informed consent. The questionnaires were completed anonymously, and participants were informed that they could withdraw without penalty. Because the instruments addressed occupational stress and burnout, referral information for an appropriate mental-health professional or guidance service was made available to participants who experienced discomfort. Completed questionnaires were checked for completeness, assigned identification codes, and encoded for analysis. Electronic data were stored in a password-protected file accessible only to the researchers and were used solely for research purposes.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the demographic profile of the respondents?

Table 1. Distribution of the Respondents according to their Demographic Profile

Profile	Frequency n = 52	Percentage
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	15	28.80
Female	37	71.20
<u>Age</u>		
20-29 YO	44	84.60
30-39 YO	8	15.40
<u>Length of Service</u>		
0-2 YRS	26	50.00
3-5 YRS	16	30.80
6-10 YRS	10	19.20
<u>Educational Attainment</u>		
Bachelor's Degree	37	71.15
Master's Degree	15	28.85
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	39	75.00
Married	13	25.00
<u>Combined Family Income</u>		
10,000 & below	5	9.60
10,001 - 20,000	22	42.30
20,001 - 30,000	12	23.10
30,001 - 40,000	8	15.40
40,001 & above	5	9.60

Table 1 shows that the teaching workforce of the selected institution was predominantly female, aged 20–29 years, single, and composed mainly of bachelor's degree holders. Half of the teachers had two years or less of teaching experience, indicating a relatively early-career workforce. The largest income group reported a combined family income of ₱10,001–₱20,000. These characteristics describe the participating teachers and provide context for the subsequent group comparisons; however, they should not be interpreted as representative of private-school teachers beyond the selected institution.

Research Question 2: What is the level of occupational stress experienced by the respondents?

Table 2. Level of Stress Experienced by Teachers

Category	M	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Time Management	3.26	0.69	Medium Strength
Work-Related Stressors	3.12	0.77	Medium Strength
Professional Distress	2.80	0.82	Mild Strength
Discipline and Motivation	3.14	0.93	Medium Strength
Professional Investment	2.53	0.72	Mild Strength
Emotional Manifestations	2.53	1.14	Mild Strength
Fatigue Manifestations	3.13	1.01	Medium Strength
Cardiovascular Manifestations	2.91	1.03	Mild Strength
Gastronomical Manifestations	2.41	1.25	Mild Strength
Behavioral Manifestations	1.72	0.85	No Strength
Overall Mean	2.75	0.60	Mild Strength

As shown in Table 2, the teachers generally experienced mild occupational stress ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.60$). Time management emerged as the most evident concern, while discipline and motivation, fatigue manifestations, and work-related stressors were likewise interpreted as having medium strength. Behavioral manifestations were least evident. The relatively greater variability in some physical and emotional manifestations further indicates that teachers did not experience occupational strain uniformly.

The pattern is consistent with previous evidence identifying time pressure, workload, multiple responsibilities, and student-related demands as recurring sources of teacher stress (Agyapong et al., 2022; Aloe et al., 2014b; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). From the Job Demands–Resources perspective, the prominence of time management, work-related demands, discipline concerns, and fatigue may be understood as areas in which sustained occupational demands require corresponding resources and support. The mild overall stress level likewise indicates that the more evident concerns were concentrated in particular domains rather than reflecting uniformly elevated stress across the participating teachers.

Research Question 3: What is the frequency of burnout experienced by the respondents?

Table 3. Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Teachers

Category	M	SD	Interpretation
Emotional Exhaustion	2.95	1.13	Experienced a few times a month
Depersonalization	1.84	1.25	Experienced once a month or less
Personal Accomplishment	4.09	0.85	Experienced once a week

Table 3 shows that emotional exhaustion was experienced a few times a month ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.13$), while depersonalization was experienced once a month or less ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 1.25$). Personal accomplishment obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.85$), indicating that the teachers experienced feelings of competence and professional achievement once a week. Thus, periodic emotional depletion was more evident than psychological distancing, while teachers continued to report experiences of professional competence and achievement.

This pattern supports Maslach and Jackson's multidimensional conceptualization of burnout, in which emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment should be interpreted separately rather than combined into a single burnout judgment. The comparatively greater frequency of emotional exhaustion is consistent with evidence associating workload, time pressure, and overlapping responsibilities with teachers' emotional depletion (Carroll et al., 2022; Magtalas & Eduvala, 2024). Moreover, relatively infrequent depersonalization and continuing personal accomplishment are compatible

with findings that teachers may maintain professional commitment despite occupational strain (Pabatang et al., 2022). This distinction is important because teacher burnout has also been associated with less favorable classroom and student outcomes (Madigan & Kim, 2021).

Research Question 4: Is there a statistically significant difference in the teachers' level of occupational stress when they are grouped according to their demographic characteristics?

Table 4: Differences in the Level of Occupational Stress Experienced by Respondents according to Sex

Category	Sex	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Time Management	Male	15	23.80	268.000	0.052
	Female	37	23.54		
Work-Related Stressors	Male	15	31.47	203.000	0.131
	Female	37	24.49		
Professional Distress	Male	15	26.30	274.500	0.951
	Female	37	26.58		
Discipline and Motivation	Male	15	26.87	272.000	0.911
	Female	37	26.35		
Professional Investment	Male	15	26.10	271.500	0.903
	Female	37	26.66		
Emotional Manifestations	Male	15	29.93	226.000	0.297
	Female	37	25.11		
Fatigue Manifestations	Male	15	26.83	272.500	0.919
	Female	37	26.36		
Cardiovascular Manifestations	Male	15	23.50	272.500	0.063
	Female	37	23.66		
Gastronomical Manifestations	Male	15	29.27	236.000	0.394
	Female	37	25.38		
Behavioral Manifestations	Male	15	31.63	200.500	0.112
	Female	37	24.42		

Table 4 shows that occupational stress did not significantly differ according to sex across any of the ten domains examined, as all p values exceeded the .05 level of significance. The smallest p values were observed for time management ($p = .052$) and cardiovascular manifestations ($p = .063$); however, neither met the predetermined criterion for statistical significance. Accordingly, the numerical differences in mean ranks between male and female teachers should not be interpreted as evidence of reliable sex-based differences in occupational stress. The findings indicate that sex did not significantly differentiate the occupational stress experiences of the participating teachers. This differs partly from Lleve et al. (2024), who reported sex-related differences in selected forms of job stress among private-school teachers, but is consistent with the broader observation of Purvanova and Muros (2010) that demographic differences in occupational well-being are often small and context-dependent. From the Job Demands–Resources perspective, the absence of significant sex differences also supports interpreting occupational stress primarily in relation to the demands and resources present within the work environment rather than attributing stress patterns to sex alone (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Nevertheless, the unequal number of male and female participants should be considered when interpreting these comparisons.

Table 5. Differences in the Level of Occupational Stress Experienced by Respondents according to Age

Category	Age	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Time Management	20-29 YO	44	25.80	145.000	0.430
	30-39 YO	8	30.38		
Work-Related Stressors	20-29 YO	44	26.61	171.000	0.899
	30-39 YO	8	25.88		
Professional Distress	20-29 YO	44	26.83	161.500	0.712
	30-39 YO	8	24.69		
Discipline and Motivation	20-29 YO	44	27.23	144.000	0.416
	30-39 YO	8	22.50		
Professional Investment	20-29 YO	44	26.07	157.000	0.628
	30-39 YO	8	28.88		

Emotional Manifestations	20-29 YO	44	26.35	169.500	0.869
	30-39 YO	8	27.31		
Fatigue Manifestations	20-29 YO	44	26.06	156.500	0.620
	30-39 YO	8	28.94		
Cardiovascular Manifestations	20-29 YO	44	25.09	114.000	0.114
	30-39 YO	8	34.25		
Gastronomical Manifestations	20-29 YO	44	27.03	152.500	0.545
	30-39 YO	8	23.56		
Behavioral Manifestations	20-29 YO	44	25.34	125.000	0.187
	30-39 YO	8	32.88		

Table 5 shows no statistically significant differences in any occupational-stress domain according to age. Accordingly, differences in the displayed mean ranks are not interpreted as evidence that either age group experienced greater occupational stress. The findings differ from research suggesting greater adjustment-related strain among younger or early-career teachers (Brewer & Shapard, 2004; Carroll et al., 2022), but are compatible with local evidence showing that demographic differences in teacher well-being are not consistently observed across settings (Guillermo, 2024). Interpretation should also consider the substantial subgroup imbalance, with only eight teachers represented in the 30–39-year age category.

Table 6. Differences in the Level of Occupational Stress Experienced by Respondents according to Length of Service

Length of Service	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
Time Management					
0-2 YRS	26	26.87	2.007	2	0.367
3-5 YRS	16	22.84			
6-10 YRS	10	31.40			
Work-Related Stressors					
0-2 YRS	26	25.40	0.320	2	0.852
3-5 YRS	16	27.09			
6-10 YRS	10	28.40			
Professional Distress					
0-2 YRS	26	22.13	4.352	2	0.113
3-5 YRS	16	30.97			
6-10 YRS	10	30.70			
Discipline and Motivation					
0-2 YRS	26	26.85	0.030	2	0.985
3-5 YRS	16	26.28			
6-10 YRS	10	25.95			
Professional Investment					
0-2 YRS	26	22.17	9.154	2	0.010
3-5 YRS	16	35.97			
6-10 YRS	10	22.60			
Emotional Manifestations					
0-2 YRS	26	27.33	1.040	2	0.595
3-5 YRS	16	27.88			
6-10 YRS	10	22.15			
Fatigue Manifestations					
0-2 YRS	26	27.83	5.392	2	0.067
3-5 YRS	16	19.94			
6-10 YRS	10	33.55			
Cardiovascular Manifestations					
0-2 YRS	26	27.75	0.366	2	0.833
3-5 YRS	16	25.47			
6-10 YRS	10	24.90			
Gastronomical Manifestations					
0-2 YRS	26	28.60	1.191	2	0.551
3-5 YRS	16	23.47			
6-10 YRS	10	25.90			
Behavioral Manifestations					
0-2 YRS	26	29.75	3.323	2	0.190
3-5 YRS	16	25.34			
6-10 YRS	10	19.90			

Table 6 shows that length of service did not significantly differentiate in nine of the ten occupational-stress domains. The exception was professional investment, $H(2) = 9.154$, $p = .010$, $\varepsilon^2 = .146$. Dunn's

pairwise comparison with Bonferroni adjustment indicated that teachers with three to five years of service reported greater professional-investment stress than those with zero to two years of service, adjusted $p = .012$; the other pairwise comparisons were not significant. Although fatigue manifestations yielded $p = .067$, this value does not meet the predetermined .05 criterion and should not be interpreted as evidence of a group difference. The professional-investment finding suggests a possible career-stage concern among teachers with three to five years of service. This findings is aligned with the Job Demands–Resources Model, which recognizes that changing professional demands require corresponding opportunities and resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), and with evidence that occupational experiences may vary across career stages rather than simply declining with greater experience (Brewer & Shapard, 2004).

Table 7. Differences in the Level of Occupational Stress Experienced by Respondents according to Educational Attainment

Category	Educational Attainment	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Time Management	Bachelor's Degree	15	33.80	268.000	0.926
	Master's Degree	37	23.54		
Work-Related Stressors	Bachelor's Degree	15	31.47	203.000	0.131
	Master's Degree	37	24.49		
Professional Distress	Bachelor's Degree	15	26.30	274.500	0.951
	Master's Degree	37	26.58		
Discipline and Motivation	Bachelor's Degree	15	26.87	272.000	0.911
	Master's Degree	37	26.35		
Professional Investment	Bachelor's Degree	15	26.10	271.500	0.903
	Master's Degree	37	26.66		
Emotional Manifestations	Bachelor's Degree	15	29.93	226.000	0.297
	Master's Degree	37	25.11		
Fatigue Manifestations	Bachelor's Degree	15	26.83	272.500	0.919
	Master's Degree	37	26.36		
Cardiovascular Manifestations	Bachelor's Degree	15	33.50	272.500	0.933
	Master's Degree	37	23.66		
Gastronomical Manifestations	Bachelor's Degree	15	29.27	236.000	0.394
	Master's Degree	37	25.38		
Behavioral Manifestations	Bachelor's Degree	15	31.63	200.500	0.112
	Master's Degree	37	24.42		

Table 7 shows that occupational stress did not significantly differ according to educational attainment across any of the ten domains examined, as all p values exceeded the .05 level of significance. Thus, although numerical differences in mean ranks were observed between teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees, these differences were not statistically reliable and should not be interpreted as evidence that educational attainment differentiated occupational stress among the participating teachers.

This finding differs from Pabatang et al. (2022), who reported differences in selected burnout dimensions according to educational attainment among tertiary educators. The variation may reflect differences in educational setting, occupational conditions, and participant characteristics. The present result is more consistent with evidence emphasizing workload, classroom demands, professional resources, and institutional support as important factors in teachers' occupational well being (Bottiani et al., 2019; Carroll et al., 2022). From the Job Demands–Resources perspective, educational attainment is better regarded as a contextual characteristic rather than a direct occupational demand or resource. Nevertheless, the unequal subgroup sizes should be considered when interpreting the comparison.

Table 8. Differences in the Level of Occupational Stress Experienced by Respondents according to Marital Statues

Category	Marital Status	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Time Management	Single	39	26.79	242.000	0.807
	Married	13	25.62		
Work-Related Stressors	Single	39	26.13	239.000	0.758
	Married	13	27.62		
Professional Distress	Single	39	27.01	233.500	0.671
	Married	13	24.96		
Discipline and Motivation	Single	39	27.28	223.000	0.518
	Married	13	24.15		
Professional Investment	Single	39	27.38	219.000	0.463
	Married	13	23.85		

Emotional Manifestations	Single Married	39 13	28.28 21.15	184.000	0.141
Fatigue Manifestations	Single Married	39 13	27.81 22.58	202.500	0.280
Cardiovascular Manifestations	Single Married	39 13	27.08 24.77	231.000	0.633
Gastronomical Manifestations	Single Married	39 13	26.96 25.12	235.500	0.699
Behavioral Manifestations	Single Married	39 13	28.81 19.58	163.500	0.052

Table 8 shows no statistically significant differences in occupational stress according to marital status. Although some mean ranks differ numerically, these descriptive variations do not constitute evidence that single or married teachers experienced reliably different levels of stress. This is consistent with literature indicating that marital status does not demonstrate a uniform relationship with teacher stress because family circumstances may function as either resources or additional demands depending on context (Agyapong et al., 2022). From the Job Demands–Resources perspective, marital status itself is not a job demand or resource and should therefore not be treated as a direct explanation of occupational stress (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Table 9. Differences in the Level of Occupational Stress Experienced by Respondents according to Combined Family Income

Combined Family Income	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
Time Management					
10,000 & BLW	5	34.50	6.989	4	0.136
10,001 - 20,000	22	22.02			
20,001 - 30,000	12	23.75			
30,001 - 40,000	8	31.38			
40,001 & ABV	5	37.00			
Combined Family Income					
Work-Related Stressors					
10,000 & BLW	5	25.60	7.789	4	0.100
10,001 - 20,000	22	25.66			
20,001 - 30,000	12	24.04			
30,001 - 40,000	8	22.13			
40,001 & ABV	5	44.00			
Combined Family Income					
Professional Distress					
10,000 & BLW	5	21.50	3.676	4	0.452
10,001 - 20,000	22	28.45			
20,001 - 30,000	12	23.21			
30,001 - 40,000	8	23.44			
40,001 & ABV	5	35.70			
Combined Family Income					
Discipline and Motivation					
10,000 & BLW	5	16.20	5.167	4	0.271
10,001 - 20,000	22	26.16			
20,001 - 30,000	12	26.08			
30,001 - 40,000	8	27.44			
40,001 & ABV	5	37.80			
Combined Family Income					
Professional Investment					
10,000 & BLW	5	17.20	2.297	4	0.681
10,001 - 20,000	22	27.82			
20,001 - 30,000	12	26.17			
30,001 - 40,000	8	27.38			
40,001 & ABV	5	29.40			
Combined Family Income					
Emotional Manifestations					
10,000 & BLW	5	22.00	6.530	4	0.163
10,001 - 20,000	22	23.61			
20,001 - 30,000	12	27.67			
30,001 - 40,000	8	25.88			
40,001 & ABV	5	41.90			

Combined Family Income Fatigue Manifestations	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
10,000 & BLW	5	20.30	9.319	4	0.054
10,001 - 20,000	22	23.07			
20,001 - 30,000	12	27.58			
30,001 - 40,000	8	26.88			
40,001 & ABV	5	45.60			
Combined Family Income Cardiovascular Manifestations	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
10,000 & BLW	5	18.80	9.248	4	0.055
10,001 - 20,000	22	23.23			
20,001 - 30,000	12	26.50			
30,001 - 40,000	8	29.50			
40,001 & ABV	5	43.80			
Combined Family Income Gastronomical Manifestations	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
10,000 & BLW	5	22.50	8.737	4	0.068
10,001 - 20,000	22	22.84			
20,001 - 30,000	12	29.21			
30,001 - 40,000	8	24.38			
40,001 & ABV	5	43.50			
Combined Family Income Behavioral Manifestations	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
10,000 & BLW	5	27.60	4.969	4	0.290
10,001 - 20,000	22	24.16			
20,001 - 30,000	12	20.79			
30,001 - 40,000	8	35.31			
40,001 & ABV	5	45.30			

No statistically significant differences in occupational stress were found across combined-family-income groups, as shown in Table 4.6. The comparatively high mean ranks displayed by some income categories are therefore not interpreted as evidence of reliable income-related differences. This caution is particularly important because the lowest and highest income categories each contained only five teachers, making subgroup comparisons relatively unstable. The finding differs from Lleve et al. (2024), who reported an association between monthly salary and external job stress; however, monthly salary and combined family income represent different economic indicators. More broadly, the absence of statistically reliable income differences is compatible with evidence emphasizing workload, time pressure, classroom demands, and institutional resources as more proximal occupational conditions associated with teacher stress (Agyapong et al., 2022; Carroll et al., 2022).

Research Question 5: Is there a statistically significant difference in the teachers' frequency of burnout when they are grouped according to their demographic characteristics?

Table 10. Differences in the Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Respondents according to Sex

Category	Sex	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Emotional Exhaustion	Male	15	25.53	263.000	0.769
	Female	37	26.89		
Depersonalization	Male	15	27.97	255.500	0.656
	Female	37	25.91		
Personal Accomplishment	Male	15	26.93	271.000	0.895
	Female	37	26.32		

Table 10 shows that the frequency of burnout did not significantly differ according to sex across emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment, as all p-values exceeded the .05 level of significance. This is consistent with Purvanova and Muros (2010), who emphasized that sex-related differences in burnout are generally small and may vary across specific dimensions rather than exhibit a uniform pattern. The finding also corresponds with Agyapong et al. (2022), who noted that demographic characteristics do not consistently account for teacher burnout when occupational demands and

organizational conditions are considered. Thus, within the present institutional context, sex alone did not appear to distinguish the teachers' reported burnout experiences.

Table 11. Differences in the Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Respondents according to Age

Category	Age	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Emotional Exhaustion	20-29 YO	44	26.09	158.000	0.648
	30-39 YO	8	28.75		
Depersonalization	20-29 YO	44	25.75	143.000	0.401
	30-39 YO	8	30.63		
Personal Accomplishment	20-29 YO	44	26.78	163.500	0.751
	30-39 YO	8	24.94		

Table 11 shows no statistically significant differences in emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, or personal accomplishment according to age, as all p-values exceeded .05. Hence, the absence of significant age-related differences differs from studies suggesting that younger workers may experience greater vulnerability to emotional exhaustion because of professional-adjustment demands (Brewer & Shapard, 2004; Carroll et al., 2022). However, the finding is consistent with Guillermo (2024), who likewise reported no significant demographic differences in burnout among teachers in Isabela. The present result suggests that age did not reliably distinguish burnout within the participating teachers.

Table 12. Differences in the Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Respondents according to Length of Service

Length of Service	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
Emotional Exhaustion					
0-2 YRS	26	25.19	0.392	2	0.822
3-5 YRS	16	27.66			
6-10 YRS	10	28.05			
Length of Service	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
Depersonalization					
0-2 YRS	26	24.42	1.194	2	0.550
3-5 YRS	16	27.50			
6-10 YRS	10	30.30			
Length of Service	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	p-value
Personal Accomplishment					
0-2 YRS	26	28.54	4.569	2	0.102
3-5 YRS	16	20.00			
6-10 YRS	10	31.60			

Table 12 shows that emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment did not significantly differ according to length of service, as all p-values exceeded the .05 level of significance. This finding does not provide support for a consistent career-stage pattern in burnout, despite previous evidence suggesting that professional experience may correspond with variations in emotional exhaustion and other occupational experiences (Brewer & Shapard, 2004; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). Instead, it is consistent with Guillermo (2024), who found no significant differences in teacher burnout across demographic groups. Within the Job Demands–Resources perspective, length of service may correspond with different professional demands and resources.

Table 13. Differences in the Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Respondents according to Educational Attainment

Category	Educational Attainment	N	Mean Rank	U	p-value
Emotional Exhaustion	Bachelor's Degree	39	27.36	220	0.478
	Master's Degree	13	23.92		
Depersonalization	Bachelor's Degree	39	25.64	220	0.478
	Master's Degree	13	29.08		
Personal Accomplishment	Bachelor's Degree	39	27.23	225	0.546
	Master's Degree	13	24.31		

Table 13 shows that the frequency of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment did not significantly differ according to educational attainment, as all p-values exceeded .05. Accordingly, the finding differs from Pabatang et al. (2022), who reported differences in selected burnout dimensions according to educational attainment among tertiary educators. Such divergence may reflect differences in institutional context, teaching level, participant characteristics, and occupational conditions. The present finding is more consistent with studies emphasizing that burnout is closely associated with immediate work demands and available professional resources, including workload, classroom demands, collegial support, and institutional resources (Bottiani et al., 2019; Carroll et al., 2022). Educational attainment, therefore, did not significantly distinguish burnout within the participating teachers.

Table 14. Differences in the Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Respondents according to Marital Status

Category	Marital Status	N	Mean Rank	U	P-value
Emotional Exhaustion	Single	39	28.49	176.000	0.101
	Married	13	20.54		
Depersonalization	Single	39	27.12	229.500	0.611
	Married	13	24.65		
Personal Accomplishment	Single	39	26.29	245.500	0.865
	Married	13	27.12		

Table 14 shows no statistically significant differences in emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, or personal accomplishment according to marital status, as all p-values exceeded .05. Consequently, the findings indicate that marital status did not significantly distinguish the burnout experiences of the participating teachers. This is consistent with evidence suggesting that marital status does not demonstrate a uniform relationship with teacher burnout because family circumstances may provide support while also involving additional responsibilities (Agyapong et al., 2022). From the Job Demands–Resources perspective, marital status is not itself an occupational demand or resource; rather, burnout is more directly understood in relation to work demands and the personal and organizational resources available to manage them (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Table 15. Differences in the Frequency of Burnout Experienced by Respondents according to Combined Family Income

by Respondents according to Combined Family Income					
Combined Family Income	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	P-value
Emotional Exhaustion					
10,000 & BLW	5	21.50	7.879	4	0.096
10,001 - 20,000	22	23.91			
20,001 - 30,000	12	27.00			
30,001 - 40,000	8	25.13			
40,001 & ABV	5	43.90			
Combined Family Income	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	P-value
Depersonalization					
10,000 & BLW	5	21.30	2.501	4	0.644
10,001 - 20,000	22	24.91			
20,001 - 30,000	12	27.67			
30,001 - 40,000	8	27.06			
40,001 & ABV	5	35.00			
Combined Family Income	N	Mean Rank	H Test	df	P-value
Personal Accomplishment					
10,000 & BLW	5	29.00	2.195	4	0.700
10,001 - 20,000	22	24.86			
20,001 - 30,000	12	30.17			
30,001 - 40,000	8	21.69			
40,001 & ABV	5	30.10			

Table 15 shows that emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment did not significantly differ according to combined family income, as all p-values exceeded the .05 level of significance. This finding is consistent with evidence emphasizing occupational demands and resources—such as workload, time pressure, classroom conditions, and organizational support—as more proximal considerations in understanding teacher burnout than demographic characteristics alone (Bottiani et al., 2019; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

Research Question 6: Based on the results, what guidance intervention program can be developed to address the teachers' stress and burnout?

Since time management, work-related stressors, discipline and motivation, and fatigue manifestations emerged as the more evident stress concerns, all full-time teachers may be provided with semester-based activities focusing on workload and time management, classroom-management support, peer consultation, stress management, and wellness. These activities may be implemented by the Guidance Office in coordination with the school administration, academic coordinators, and Human Resource Office. Program outcomes may be monitored through participation rates, teacher feedback, and changes in the corresponding occupational-stress scores during subsequent evaluation.

Because emotional exhaustion was experienced a few times a month, teachers reporting recurring emotional strain may be offered individual or small-group counseling and, when necessary, confidential referral to qualified mental-health professionals. These services may be made available throughout the school year through the Guidance Office and appropriate mental-health professionals, with follow-up attendance, referral completion, teacher feedback, and changes in emotional-exhaustion scores serving as measurable indicators.

Professional investment was the only occupational-stress domain that significantly differed according to length of service, with teachers who had three to five years of service reporting greater professional-investment stress than those with zero to two years. Accordingly, this group may receive focused career-development support—such as mentoring, professional-development planning, orientation on advancement opportunities, and recognition activities—at least once each semester. These activities may be coordinated by the Human Resource Office, Guidance Office, school administration, and academic coordinators, with participation rates, completed professional-development plans, teacher feedback, and changes in professional-investment stress scores used as evaluation indicators.

Since depersonalization was relatively infrequent and personal accomplishment remained comparatively favorable, the program should also aim to sustain these positive dimensions through mentoring, collegial support, professional recognition, constructive feedback, and opportunities for meaningful participation in institutional activities. These initiatives may be implemented throughout the school year and evaluated through participation rates, teacher feedback, and the maintenance or improvement of depersonalization and personal-accomplishment scores. Because the proposed program was developed but not implemented or evaluated in the present study, its effectiveness should not be presumed; rather, it should undergo institutional review, pilot implementation, and subsequent evaluation using pre-program and post-program measures of occupational stress and burnout.

Ethical Considerations

The study received ethical clearance from the University Research Ethics Committee and administrative approval from the participating school. The ethics approval/reference number is not reported because it was not released for inclusion in the manuscript. Before participation, all teachers received written information regarding the study's purpose, procedures, possible discomforts, confidentiality safeguards, and voluntary nature, and provided informed consent. To minimize workplace pressure, data collection was conducted without the presence of supervisors or school administrators, and participants were informed that participation or refusal would not affect their employment, evaluation, or professional relationships. No identifying information was recorded on the questionnaires; numerical codes were used instead. Paper records were stored securely, while electronic files were encrypted and password-protected, with access limited to the research team. Data will be retained for five years before secure destruction. Because the instruments addressed occupational stress and burnout, participants experiencing distress or requesting assistance were offered confidential consultation with the school guidance professional and, when necessary and with consent, referral to an appropriate licensed mental-health professional. Established institutional emergency and safeguarding procedures were followed when immediate risk was identified.

Conclusion

Among the teachers in the participating private basic education center, occupational stress was generally manageable but remained evident in areas related to time management, work demands, classroom concerns, and fatigue. Burnout findings likewise reflected periodic emotional exhaustion alongside limited psychological distancing and a sustained sense of professional accomplishment. Demographic characteristics generally did not distinguish teachers' occupational stress or burnout, although professional-investment concerns appeared more salient at a particular stage of teaching service. Taken together, the findings suggest that teacher well-being in the participating institution may be better understood through specific occupational demands and professional-support needs rather than through demographic characteristics alone. These findings provide an institution-specific basis for developing preventive and developmental support focused on workload management, classroom support, emotional wellness, and career development. Because the study was cross-sectional, relied on self-reported experiences, and involved teachers from only one institution, the conclusions should remain confined to this setting and should not be interpreted as causal or generalized to the broader teaching population.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the participating institution may prioritize support for the occupational concerns that were most evident among its teachers, particularly time and workload management, classroom-management demands, fatigue, emotional wellness, and professional development. Additional career-development support may also be considered for teachers experiencing professional-investment concerns. These recommendations are directly grounded in the stress and burnout patterns identified in the present study. The specific strategies incorporated into the proposed guidance intervention program—such as mentoring, counseling, wellness activities, recognition initiatives, and structured professional-development support, should be regarded as plausible institutional responses rather than established effective interventions. Because the program was not implemented or evaluated, any initial use should be treated as a pilot and assessed through teacher feedback, participation indicators, and changes in relevant occupational-stress and burnout measures before broader or continued implementation. Future studies may involve multiple schools, larger and more balanced samples, and additional organizational or psychological variables, including workload, leadership support, school climate, coping, and resilience. Longitudinal, mixed-methods, or intervention-evaluation designs may also help determine how occupational stress and burnout change over time and whether particular support strategies produce measurable benefits.

References

- Agyapong, B., Obuobi-Donkor, G., Burbach, L., & Wei, Y. (2022). Stress, burnout, anxiety and depression among teachers: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(17), Article 10706. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710706>
- Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2014a). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 26(1), 101–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0>
- Aloe, A. M., Shisler, S. M., Norris, B. D., Nickerson, A. B., & Rinker, T. W. (2014b). A multivariate meta-analysis of student misbehavior and teacher burnout. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 30–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.05.003>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands–Resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bottiani, J. H., Duran, C. A. K., Pas, E. T., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2019). Teacher stress and burnout in urban middle schools: Associations with job demands, resources, and effective classroom practices. *Journal of School Psychology*, 77, 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.10.002>
- Brandão, T., Alfacinha, L., Brites, R., & Diniz, E. (2025). Burnout in teachers: The role of emotion regulation, empathy, and educational level taught. *School Mental Health*, 17(3), 1014–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-025-09794-7>
- Brewer, E. W., & Shapard, L. (2004). Employee burnout: A meta-analysis of the relationship between age or years of experience. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(2), 102–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484304263335>

- Cammayo, P. M. T., Aquino, C. S., & Gomez, M. G. A. (2022). Factors predicting stress and burnout of Filipino teachers engaged in remote learning. *Philippine Journal of Labor and Industrial Relations*, 39, 200–233. <https://journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/pjlr/article/view/9397>
- 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>
- Fimian, M. J. (1984). The development of an instrument to measure occupational stress in teachers: The Teacher Stress Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 57(4), 277–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1984.tb00169.x>
- Fimian, M. J. (1986). Note on reliability of the Teacher Stress Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 59(1), 275–278. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pro.1986.59.1.275>
- Fimian, M. J., & Fastenau, P. S. (1990). The validity and reliability of the Teacher Stress Inventory: A re-analysis of aggregate data. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(2), 151–157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110206>
- Gamalo, A. C., & Abellana, A. L. (2025). Teacher's workload and behavioral management practices on professional burnout of teachers in Malaybalay City. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(6), 655–664. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90600055>
- Guillermo, N. C. (2024). Job burnout and job satisfaction among secondary public-school teachers of Burgos District, Burgos, Isabela amidst the pandemic: Basis for support system program. *Saringit*, 4(1), 28–31. <https://sites.google.com/deped.gov.ph/sdoisabelaresearchportal/saringit-research-journal/saringit-volume-4/ni%C3%B1o-c-guillermo>
- Lleve, E. E., Casinillo, L. F., & Salabao, A. A. (2024). Internal and external job stress of high school teachers in a private institution. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science—Social Sciences*, 14(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.46223/HCMCOUJS.soci.en.14.1.3075.2024>
- Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Does teacher burnout affect students? A systematic review of its association with academic achievement and student-reported outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 105, Article 101714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714>
- Magtalas, S. A., & Eduvala, J. C. (2024). Teacher's workload in relation to burnout and work performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(10), 4111–4123. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.10.24>
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (2018). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (4th ed.). Mind Garden.
- Pabatang, O., Jr., Zabala, V., Amparo, J., Aquino, J., & Basa, G. (2022). Teachers' burnout levels and coping strategies in the time of pandemic: Basis for a proposed program to manage teachers burnout. *Asia Research Network Journal of Education*, 2(3), 166–189. <https://soo5.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/arnje/article/view/259702>
- Purvanova, R. K., & Muros, J. P. (2010). Gender differences in burnout: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 168–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.006>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of teacher burnout: Relations with potential stressors at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(4), 775–790. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9391-0>
- Westphal, A., Kalinowski, E., Hoferichter, C. J., & Vock, M. (2022). K–12 teachers' stress and burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 920326. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.920326>
- World Health Organization. (2019, May 28). *Burn-out an "occupational phenomenon": International Classification of Diseases*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases>