Balancing the Scales: The Impact of Faculty Workload in Relation to Burnout and Teaching Efficacy of Bisu System

Riza Beltran-Salipong, PhD

School of Advance Studies, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2025.1010000015

Received: 11 October 2025; Accepted: 18 October 2025; Published: 28 October 2025

ABSTRACT

This study explored the relationship between faculty workload, burnout, and teaching efficacy among instructors in the Bohol Island State University (BISU) system. Using a descriptive-correlational design, the research examined faculty perceptions across three major domains: workload engagement, burnout experiences, and instructional efficacy. Results indicated a high level of faculty workload engagement (M = 2.81), suggesting that faculty frequently face time constraints and overlapping commitments. Despite this, burnout levels remained low (M = 2.52), and teaching efficacy was rated very high across all domains, including preparation, classroom techniques, subject mastery, student relations, management, and evaluation.

Correlation analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between workload and burnout ($r = 0.698$, $p < .001$), indicating that increasing workload may heighten the risk of burnout over time. However, no significant relationship was found between workload and teaching efficacy ($r = 0.181$, $p = 0.339$), suggesting that faculty maintain strong instructional performance despite workload pressures. These findings highlight the resilience and professionalism of BISU faculty, while emphasizing the need for institutional support mechanisms to manage workload and protect faculty well-being. Recommendations include workload redistribution, wellness programs, and ongoing professional development to sustain teaching quality and prevent long-term burnout.

Keywords: Faculty workload, burnout, teaching efficacy, instructional performance, resilience, professional competence, higher education, Bohol Island State University (BISU), workload management, faculty well-being.

Educational institutions are designed to be the ideal settings for educators to apply and enhance their professional skills. However, the growing demands placed on faculty workload pose a significant threat to their teaching efficacy, which in turn can affect student learning outcomes.

Research by Rose and Sika (2019) indicates that teachers' workload in public sector universities profoundly impacts their efficiency and students' academic performance. This study highlights the increasing stress and burnout among educators, often overwhelmed by large class sizes, extensive administrative responsibilities, and heightened performance expectations.

Additional literature supports these findings, showing that excessive workload can diminish an educator's ability to deliver high-quality instruction (Smith et al., 2020). While some argue that additional tasks may provide opportunities for professional growth and experiential learning, the reality is that these benefits are not universally experienced. Overburdened faculty members are likely to experience fatigue and diminished job satisfaction, which can negatively impact their teaching effectiveness and their students' learning experiences (Jones & Brown, 2018).

The researcher was prompted to study these concerns due to the numerous responsibilities faculty members face. These responsibilities include various designations, attending meetings, and participating in both online and face-to-face seminars. Additionally, faculty members are burdened with preparing paperwork and documents for ISO, AACUP, and other evaluation processes. They also have to oversee student activities such

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

as intramural sports and mandated institutional celebrations. These demands consume time that should be dedicated to teaching and learning, which is the instructor's primary responsibility.

Understanding the impact of faculty workload on teaching efficacy is crucial for improving student learning outcomes. Excessive workloads can lead to teacher burnout, reduced job satisfaction, and diminished teaching quality, which adversely affect students' academic performance and satisfaction. This study aims to investigate the relationship between faculty workload and teaching efficacy, providing insights to inform policies and practices that enhance educator well-being and instructional effectiveness. By optimizing workload management, educational institutions can ensure a more supportive environment for both educators and students, ultimately leading to better educational outcomes

RELATED LITERATURE

The theoretical framework for the study is based on the following theoretical perspectives. One of the main theoretical frameworks commonly used to understand the impact of workload on burnout and teachers' efficiency The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model by Bakker,A.B. et.al (2014) posits that job demands (e.g., workload, time pressure, administrative tasks) and job resources (e.g., support, professional development opportunities, autonomy) influence employees' well-being and job performance. High job demands can lead to burnout, characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. In the context of BISU, this model helps explain how excessive workload demands deplete faculty members' emotional and cognitive resources, leading to burnout and reduced teaching efficacy. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) by Jackson, Susan E. (1981; 2015) is a widely used tool for assessing burnout. It measures three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. This framework will be utilized to evaluate the burnout levels among BISU faculty members and understand how these dimensions are influenced by workload. By applying the MBI, the study can identify specific areas where workload contributes to burnout, offering targeted insights for intervention. The Conservation of Resources (COR)by Holmegreen L. et. al (2017) theory suggests that individuals strive to obtain, retain, and protect their resources (e.g., time, energy, emotional resilience). When these resources are threatened or depleted, stress and burnout can occur. Applying COR theory to the BISU context, the study examines how the demands of workload threaten faculty resources, leading to stress and burnout, and consequently diminishing their teaching effectiveness.

Several legal and policy frameworks support balanced faculty workloads to protect educator well-being and maintain teaching quality. Goal 4 of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Education 2030 Framework advocate for quality education, promoting environments that reduce excessive workload for educators to ensure their effectiveness and enhance student outcomes (UNESCO, 2015). The Philippine Mental Health Act (RA No. 11036) also mandates workplace support for mental health, encouraging institutions to minimize stressors such as heavy workloads that contribute to burnout (DOH, 2018). Further, CHED Memorandum Order No. 52, s. 2016, sets workload policies for faculty in state universities and colleges, providing for balanced responsibilities across teaching, research, and administrative duties (CHED, 2016). Lastly, Civil Service Commission guidelines regulate faculty workload and job standards for university staff, aiming to prevent burnout and uphold teaching quality (CSC, 2020).

Faculty workload has been widely recognized as a central concern in higher education, with many studies noting its impact on professional efficacy, health, and teaching quality. Winefield et al. (2003) observed that increasing administrative and academic responsibilities often compel faculty to multitask, relying on strategies such as prioritization lists to manage competing demands. This aligns with the concept of time poverty, where educators feel there are "too many demands" and "not enough hours in the day" to meet expectations. Kinman and Wray (2013) emphasized that such conditions reduce well-being and increase stress levels among academics. Despite these pressures, some studies report that educators maintain strong professional commitment and resilience, often continuing to meet their obligations even under heavy workload (Kinman & Wray, 2013). However, persistent exposure to high workload without adequate support can lead to burnout, manifested in emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

Burnout among educators has been widely examined in the literature, typically conceptualized by Maslach and Leiter (2016) as comprising three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Studies have shown that despite the presence of occupational stressors, many faculty members demonstrate resilience and professional commitment, preventing the progression of stress into severe burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Job resources, such as administrative support, recognition, and collegial relationships, have been identified as protective factors that buffer the negative effects of workload and stress (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Taris et al., 2001). Conversely, the absence of such resources, coupled with excessive criticism and lack of support from supervisors, has been linked to heightened emotional exhaustion and dissatisfaction among teachers (Taris et al., 2001). Research further indicates that while educators may experience physical strain and temporal fatigue as part of their workload, strong vocational commitment and a sense of purpose serve as buffers against disengagement and attrition (Hong, 2010).

The findings indicate that faculty demonstrate professional resilience, echoing Maslach and Leiter's (2016) view of burnout as involving emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced accomplishment. High mean scores on positive items—such as optimism about teaching and perceived administrative support—suggest that job resources serve as protective factors, consistent with Schaufeli and Bakker's (2004) framework. Conversely, low scores on negative items (e.g., excessive criticism, lack of support) reinforce the buffering role of supportive leadership, as noted by Taris et al. (2001).

Moderate ratings on stress-related items (e.g., physical strain, prolonged teaching days) point to emerging challenges that, if unmanaged, may escalate into burnout. However, the low endorsement of regret over career choice highlights strong vocational commitment, aligning with Hong's (2010) assertion that intrinsic dedication mitigates burnout risks. Overall, the results reflect a balance between resilience and underlying stressors, underscoring the importance of sustaining support systems to maintain teaching efficacy.

Teaching efficacy has been widely documented as a critical factor in promoting instructional quality and student learning outcomes. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) emphasized that high levels of teaching efficacy are reflected in teachers' ability to plan effectively, utilize flexible pedagogical strategies, and demonstrate strong subject matter expertise, all of which contribute to learner-centered instruction. Research also underscores the importance of positive teacher-student relationships, where fostering self-discipline and encouraging participation are strongly linked to student motivation and social-emotional development (Hamre & Pianta, 2006). In addition, effective classroom management—characterized by timely achievement of objectives and lesson preparedness—has been shown to enhance instructional quality and minimize off-task behavior (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Equally important are teachers' evaluation practices, with Black and Wiliam (1998) highlighting the role of clear assessment criteria and continuous feedback in fostering improvement and strengthening the teaching-learning process. Beyond instructional competencies, scholars also stress the significance of personal and social attributes such as honesty, ethical grounding, and commitment to professional growth, which are strongly associated with self-efficacy, moral leadership, and institutional trust (Hoy & Spero, 2005). Moreover, studies have established a significant relationship between teachers' workload and burnout, suggesting that while professional competence may remain strong, excessive demands can impact teachers' well-being and long-term effectiveness (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

The impact of workload on teachers' efficiency is a widely researched topic in education. This literature review examines key findings from studies on this topic within the public Bohol Island State University System in Bohol Province. Accordingly, Teachers are vital in realizing effective education in the classroom. However, they are exposed to variety of difficulties, such as an increase in workload (Pacaol, N., 2021). Work overload is one of the factors causing burnout among teachers it causes reduced physical and emotional energy (Jomuad, 2021)

Recent research highlights the significant impact of faculty workload on burnout levels among university educators. A study by Johnson et al. (2023) examines the relationship between excessive workload and burnout in higher education institutions. The findings suggest that high workloads contribute to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, key components of burnout, which in turn affect teaching efficacy and overall job satisfaction.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

In the Philippines, teachers are also overwhelmed by their workload, which negatively affects their teaching performance. David et al. (2019) highlighted that many of these extra responsibilities are administrative, including student support, documentation from seminars, budgeting, and providing advice for students' health and responsiveness. Teachers are also expected to participate in various government initiatives such as mass vaccinations, conditional cash transfers, community mapping, feeding programs, population counting, anti-drug campaigns, and election duties, among others. Blane (2021) concluded that these additional tasks are beyond teachers' job descriptions, adding to their already substantial workload.

Thakur and Ibstan (2018) found that emotional exhaustion increases with an increase in workload within an organizational context. This implies that as teachers' workload rises, their emotional exhaustion also rises. Additionally, the study highlighted that depersonalization among teachers increases with a higher workload. Conversely, the study indicated that as the workload increases, personal achievements of teachers tend to decrease, underscoring the negative impact of excessive workload on teachers' sense of accomplishment.

A recent study by Miller and Glover (2022) explores how faculty workload influences teaching efficacy. The research indicates that increased administrative and teaching responsibilities can negatively impact faculty members' self-efficacy in teaching, leading to a decline in instructional quality and student engagement.

Similarly, a study by Jomuad et al. (2021) at Misamis University in the Philippines revealed that teachers experience high levels of workload and burnout. Despite this, their work performance was rated as very satisfactory. The study concluded that workload has a significant impact on the burnout levels experienced by teachers and also affects their performance.

In the study of Kawal, Ayesha (20230 found that teacher workload has a significant impact on student academic achievement, and teacher efficiency and effectiveness. Heavy workloads can lead to stress, burnout, and decreased engagement, which negatively impact student learning outcomes. It concluded that reducing the teachers' workload and providing support to manage workload effectively can have positive impact upon both teacher and student outcomes.

Furthermore, a high workload can also lead to teacher burnout, which can have long-term effects on their health and well-being. When teachers are burnt out, they may become disengaged from their work, leading to lower levels of job satisfaction and increased turnover (Mullen, Backer, Chae & Li,2020)

Innovative strategies to mitigate burnout and enhance teaching efficacy have been the focus of recent studies. A study by Lee et al. (2023) suggests that institutional support, professional development opportunities, and workload management are critical in reducing burnout and improving teaching efficacy. The study highlights the need for universities to adopt a holistic approach to faculty well-being.

Moreover, the balance between workload and teaching efficacy is crucial. An optimal workload allows educators to engage more deeply with their students, fostering a more interactive and supportive learning environment. Conversely, when faculty members are stretched too thin, their ability to provide personalized attention and adapt to students' needs diminishes, leading to a decline in student satisfaction and learning outcomes (Williams, 2021).

Overall, these studies highlight the critical issue of workload in the teaching profession. Excessive workload leads to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and decreased personal achievement, ultimately impacting teachers' efficiency and performance. This underscores the need for effective workload management strategies to enhance teacher well-being and instructional effectiveness.

Staement of the Problem

This study investigated the relationship between workload and burnout and efficiency of BISU System faculty of the province of Bohol. It specifically aimed to:

Determine BISU faculty workload;

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

Determine BISU faculty level of burnout

Determine BISU teaching efficacy;

Explore the significant relationship between the teachers' workload and their burnout experience; and

Explore the significant relationship between the teachers' workload and their work teaching efficacy.

What is the action plan for intervention?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. It was descriptive in identifying and analyzing the levels of burnout and teaching efficacy among faculty members, and correlational in determining the relationship between workload, stress, and efficacy indicators. This design was deemed appropriate as it allowed the researcher to gather quantifiable data, describe trends, and establish statistical associations between the study variables.

Research Respondents and Locale

The respondents of the study were faculty members of Bohol Island State University – Clarin Campus, drawn through purposive sampling. The locale was chosen because of its active participation in teaching, extension, and research activities, which often expose faculty members to varying levels of workload and stress. A total of 35 faculty members participated, representing diverse academic departments to ensure comprehensive insights into burnout and teaching efficacy.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used was a standardized questionnaire adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory–Educators Survey (MBI-ES) and teaching efficacy scales validated in prior studies. The questionnaire consisted of items measuring emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment, and teaching-related attitudes. Modifications were made to fit the local context, and the tool underwent validation by experts to ensure reliability and content validity.

Role Overload Questionnaire. The construct of role overload was measured through the usage of Reilly overload scale developed by Reilly (1982) to assess the work overload of teachers. It consists of 13 items that are scaled on a Likert type scale with the response category ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The scale below was used in describing the teachers' workload:

Responses	Continuum	Continuum Interpretation 4
- Strongly Agree (SA)	3.25 – 4.0	Very High Engagement (VHE)
3 - Agree (A)	2.50 – 3.24	High Engagement (HE)
2 - Disagree (D)	1.75 – 1.49	Low Engagement (LE)
1- Strongly Disagree (SD)	1.00– 1.74	Very Low Engagement (VLE)

Burnout Questionnaire.

This is adopted from Maslach Burnout Inventory Questionnaire to assess teacher burnout syndrome. It has 21 items or statements and scaled on a 4-point Likert Scale. It has 4 subscales: (1) Career Related Stress, (2) Perceived Administrative Support,(3) Coping with Job-related Stress, and (4) Attitudes towards Students.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

The following scale for burnout was used:

Responses	Continuum	Interpretation
4 - Strongly Agree (SA)	3.25 – 4.0	Very High (VH)
3 - Agree (A)	2.5 0 – 3.24	High (H) 2
- Disagree (D)	1.75 – 1.49	Low (L)
1 - Strongly Disagree (SD)	1.00 – 1.74	Very Low (VL)

Teaching Efficacy.

It is an assessment tool he questionnaire is divided into for areas, the following are; the first part is the teaching skills which specifically asking questions about teacher's preparation, classroom techniques and understanding of subject matter. The second part is the teacher-student relationship, third part is the management skills, fourth part is the evaluation skills, and lastly is the personal and social competencies. The scale below was used in description.

Responses

5- Outstanding	4.21-5.00	Outstanding
4- Very Satisfactory	3.41-4.20	Very Satisfactory
3- Average High	2.61-3.40	Satisfactory
2- Average Low	1.81-2.60	Good
1- Needs Improvement	1.00-1.80	Poor

Statistical Treatment

The data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean and standard deviation were computed to describe the levels of burnout and teaching efficacy among respondents. Pearson's correlation coefficient was employed to determine the relationships between burnout indicators and teaching efficacy. Additionally, frequency and percentage distribution were used for demographic profiles, while t-test and ANOVA were applied to examine significant differences across groups when necessary.

Expected Output

The study is expected to provide empirical evidence on the levels of burnout and teaching efficacy among faculty members of BISU–Clarin. Results are anticipated to highlight both protective factors, such as administrative support and professional commitment, and risk factors, such as workload and stress-related physical strain.

Furthermore, the findings are expected to serve as a basis for developing targeted intervention programs, including professional development workshops, stress management initiatives, and policies that promote faculty well-being and teaching effectiveness. Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to sustaining a healthy and motivated teaching workforce, aligned with institutional goals of quality education and faculty development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and interprets the findings of the study on faculty workload and burnout at Bohol Island State University (BISU). Results reveal a generally low to moderate level of burnout (overall composite mean = 2.52), indicating that while faculty members experience workload-related stress, they demonstrate resilience and coping mechanisms that prevent extreme exhaustion. Key indicators, such as reliance on prioritization

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

strategies and perceptions of time constraints, suggest the presence of persistent pressures that may affect well-being and teaching efficacy. These findings are discussed in relation to existing literature, providing a deeper understanding of how workload demands shape faculty experiences and institutional performance.

Faculty Workload

Item	Mean	SD	
1. I have to do things that I do not really have the time and energy for.	2.87	0.82	High Engagement
2. There are too many demands on my time.	3.13	0.78	High Engagement
3. I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me.	3.03	0.85	High Engagement
4. I cannot ever seem to catch up.	2.47	0.78	High Engagement
5. I do not ever seem to have any time for myself.	2.57	0.90	High Engagement
6. There are times when I cannot meet everyone's expectations.	3.00	0.83	High Engagement
7. Many times I have to cancel commitments.	2.34	0.72	High Engagement
8. I seem to have more commitments to overcome than other co/workers s member of the family or parent I know.	2.80	0.85	High Engagement
9. I have to prepare priority lists to get all the things done. Otherwise I forget because I have so much to do.	3.30	0.70	High Engagement
10. I feel I have to do things hastily and may be less careful to get everything done.	2.63	0.85	High Engagement
Total	2.81	.80	High Engagement

The highest mean score was observed in Item 9 (M = 3.30, SD = 0.70), indicating that faculty often rely on priority lists to manage multiple responsibilities. This coping mechanism reflects the need to address cognitive overload, consistent with Winefield et al. (2003), who reported that the growing administrative and academic responsibilities of faculty often necessitate multitasking strategies to sustain performance. Similarly, Items 2 (M = 3.13, SD = 0.78) and 3 (M = 3.03, SD = 0.85) suggest that faculty members experience "too many demands on their time" and "need more hours in the day" to fulfill their professional roles. These findings highlight the presence of time poverty, which has been linked to diminished well-being and professional efficacy (Kinman & Wray, 2013).

Conversely, lower mean scores were found in Items 4 (M = 2.47) and 7 (M = 2.34), though still within the "high engagement" category. This implies that despite workload pressures, faculty continue to meet their core

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

responsibilities and avoid excessive cancellations of commitments. Such findings may reflect a strong professional commitment or cultural norms of resilience among educators in the region.

Overall, the results demonstrate consistently high engagement with workload-related stressors across all items. Although not at the extreme high end (≥ 3.5), mean scores remain well above the midpoint, affirming that workload represents a significant challenge for BISU faculty. If unaddressed, persistent workload demands may escalate into burnout, characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). The implications extend beyond faculty well-being, as workload pressures may ultimately affect teaching efficacy, student learning outcomes, and overall institutional performance, consistent with Darling-Hammond's (2000) assertion that effective teaching is compromised when educators are overburdened and inadequately supported.

Faculty Burnout

ITEM			
1 I am looking forward teaching in the future	3.66	0.48	Very High
2. I feel depressed of my teaching experiences.	1.87	0.78	Low
3. I get adequate praise from my supervisor for the job well done	3.00	0.53	High
4. The teaching day seems to drag on and on.	2.47	0.78	Low
5. I am glad that I selected teaching as a career.	3.23	0.90	High
6.The student's act like a bunch of animals	1.93	0.74	Low
7. My physical illness may be related to the stress in this job	2.77	1.01	High
8. I feel that the administrator willing to help me with classroom problems, should they arise.	3.27	0.52	Very High
9. I find hard to calm down after a day of teaching	2.03	0.67	Low
10.Teaching is more fulfilling than I expected	3.20	0.76	High
11.I believed that my effort in the classroom is unappreciated by the administrator	1.87	0.57	Low
12.If I had it do all it over again, I would not become a school Teacher	2.03	0.98	Low
13.I feel that I could do a much better job of teaching if only the problem confronting me were not so great.	2.45	0.74	Low
14.The stresses in this job is more that I can bear	2.40	0.81	Low
15.My supervisor give me more criticism than praise	1.90	0.71	Low
16. Most of my students are descent people	3.13	0.63	High
17. Most students come to school ready to learn.	2.83	0.65	High

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

18. I feel that the administrator will not help me with classroom difficulties	1.80	0.66	Low
19. I look forward to each teaching day.	3.37	0.67	Very High
20. The administrator blames for classroom problem	1.73	0.52	Ver Low
21. Students come to school with bad attitudes	2.00	0.60	Low
	2.52	0.70	Low

The overall mean burnout score of 2.52 indicates a low level of burnout among BISU faculty members, suggesting that while stressors are present, they have not escalated into severe emotional exhaustion or disengagement from the profession. This finding reflects a degree of professional resilience, consistent with Maslach and Leiter's (2016) conceptualization of burnout as comprising emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment.

High mean ratings on positive items, such as "I am looking forward to teaching in the future" (M = 3.66, SD = 0.48), "I feel that the administrator is willing to help me with classroom problems" (M = 3.27, SD = 0.52), and "I look forward to each teaching day" (M = 3.37, SD = 0.67), suggest that faculty maintain optimism and professional commitment. These findings align with Schaufeli and Bakker's (2004) assertion that job resources—including administrative support and recognition—serve as protective factors against burnout.

Conversely, low scores on negative items such as "I feel depressed of my teaching experiences" (M = 1.87, SD = 0.78), "My supervisor gives me more criticism than praise" (M = 1.90, SD = 0.71), and "The administrator blames me for classroom problems" (M = 1.73, SD = 0.52) indicate that faculty generally do not perceive excessive criticism or lack of support. This is consistent with Taris et al. (2001), who found that supportive leadership and constructive feedback significantly reduce emotional exhaustion among educators.

Nonetheless, certain items reflect moderate levels of stress, such as "My physical illness may be related to the stress in this job" (M = 2.77, SD = 1.01) and "The teaching day seems to drag on and on" (M = 2.47, SD = 0.78). These responses suggest the presence of physical strain and temporal fatigue, signaling that while overall burnout is low, chronic stress could intensify if unaddressed. Notably, the low score on Item 12, "If I had to do it all over again, I would not become a teacher" (M = 2.03, SD = 0.98), underscores a strong sense of vocational commitment, which research identifies as a buffer against burnout (Hong, 2010).

Teaching Efficacy

The overall mean burnout score of 2.52 indicates a low level of burnout among BISU faculty members, suggesting that while stressors are present, they have not escalated into severe emotional exhaustion or disengagement from the profession. This finding reflects a degree of professional resilience, consistent with Maslach and Leiter's (2016) conceptualization of burnout as comprising emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment.

ITEM			
I. TEACHING SKILLS			
A. Preparation			
. Identifies specific needs, interest, and capacities of individual students	3.57	0.50	Very High
2. Analyzes and identifies specific learning task	3.67	0.48	Very High
. Creates and tries out appropriate strategies and materials that meet needs of students	3.53	0.51	Very High
4. Prepares adequately for the day's learning activities.	3.53	0.51	Very High
5. Shows evidence of professional and cultural growth	3.60	0.50	Very High

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

TOTAL	**3.58**		**Very High**
B. Classroom Techniques			
1. Provides varied learning experiences for the development of communication	3.60	0.50	Very High
Selects appropriate available community resources for teaching-learning process	3.50	0.51	Very High
Selects, prepares and utilizes instructional materials effectively	3.57	0.50	Very High
Motivates the students regarding the lessons and task questions for critical thinking	3.60	0.50	Very High
5. Provides maximum involvement of students in the learning interaction	3.63	0.49	Very High
6. Provides a permissive and stimulating atmosphere that encouragement students.	3.53	0.51	Very High
Utilizes evaluation results as a basis for improving instruction.	3.57	0.50	Very High
TOTAL	**3.57**		**Very High**
C. Understanding of Subject Matter.	3.53	0.51	Very High
1. Show evidence of mastery of subject matter	3.60	0.50	Very High
2. Communicates ideas effectively	3.60	0.50	Very High
. Is able to effectively apply the subject to present situation and to life general	3.63	0.49	Very High
4. Make sure students understand basic ideas of the lesson	3.70	0.47	Very High
. Gives assignment that the students understand, help the learn and is related to the objectives	3.60	0.50	Very High
Total	**3.61**		**Very High**
II. TEACHER STUDENTS RELATIONSHIP			
1. Shows interest in student's problems and needs and makes provision for these	3.53	0.57	Very High
2. Stimulates and compliments students to elicit positive and active participation.	3.67	0.48	Very High
3. Functions effectively as a member of the classroom learning group.	3.63	0.49	Very High
4. Helps students develop self-discipline in and through the learning process.	3.70	0.47	Very High
Sets examples in moral and ethical behavior to students and in the community.	3.63	0.49	Very High
Total	3.63		Very High
III. MANAGEMENT SKILLS			
1. Initiates/ conducts /participates in research/meetings/collaborative endeavor for improvement of teaching-learning.	3.53	0.51	Very High
2. Prepares adequately for the days learning activities	3.57	0.50	Very High
3. Starts learning activities promptly			Very High
Administers tests effectively and returns corrected papers/work promptly.	3.50	0.51	Very High
5. Achieves teaching objectives to the optimum based on lesson/activity within time.	3.60	0.50	Very High
TOTAL	3.55		Very High
IV. EVALUATION SKILLS			
. Uses specific criteria for the accurate evaluation of individual performance.	3.70	0.47	Very High
. Selects/involves and utilizes criterion-reference test and other appropriate evaluation	3.57	0,50	Very High
3. Makes a continuing assessment of students' achievement	3.67	0.48	Very High

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

4. Analyzes and interprets evaluation results skillfully.	3.60	0.50	Very High
Utilizes evaluation results as a basis for improving instructions.	3.67	0.48	Very High
TOTAL	3.64		Very High
V. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL COMPETENCIES			
Sets the example in moral and ethical behavior to students and the community.	3.73	0.45	Very High
2. Shows honesty and integrity in all his/her activities.	3.77	0.43	Very High
3. Shows evidence of professional and cultural growth	3.73	0.45	Very High
4.	3.74		Very High

The findings reveal an overall **"Very High" level of teaching efficacy** across all domains, with composite means ranging from 3.55 to 3.64, underscoring the strong professional competence and instructional effectiveness of BISU faculty despite workload demands and potential stressors. In terms of **teaching skills**, faculty demonstrated high proficiency in preparation (M = 3.58), classroom techniques (M = 3.57), and subject matter understanding (M = 3.61), supported by high ratings in lesson analysis (M = 3.67) and ensuring student comprehension (M = 3.70), reflecting learner-centered instructional practices (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Their ability to establish a **positive teacher-student relationship** (M = 3.63) was evident in fostering self-discipline (M = 3.70) and stimulating participation (M = 3.67), reinforcing their role in social-emotional learning and motivation (Hamre & Pianta, 2006). Similarly, faculty exhibited effective **management skills** (M = 3.55), particularly in meeting objectives on time (M = 3.60) and ensuring preparedness (M = 3.57), indicative of efficient time management and classroom control (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Strong performance in **evaluation skills** (M = 3.64), especially in using specific criteria (M = 3.70) and continuous assessment (M = 3.67), highlights a culture of feedback and formative assessment that supports learning outcomes (Black & Wiliam, 1998). The highest-rated domain, **personal and social competencies** (M ≈ 3.74), emphasizes honesty (M = 3.77) and commitment to professional growth (M = 3.73), reflecting ethical grounding, self-efficacy, and moral leadership, which foster student trust and institutional integrity (Hoy & Spero, 2005).4. Significant relationship between the teachers' workload and their burnout experience

Table 4 Correlation Matrix of Faculty Workload and Faculty Burnout

Variables	1	2
1. Faculty Workload (AVE)	—	
2. Faculty Burnout (AVE)	.70***	—

Note. N = 30. Pearson's r values are reported. **p < .001.

Correlation Between Faculty Workload and Burnout

The Pearson correlation analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between faculty workload and burnout among BISU faculty, $r(28) = .70$, $p < .001$. This statistically significant result indicates that higher workloads are associated with greater levels of burnout, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The substantial effect size further suggests that workload is a meaningful predictor of burnout experiences.

This finding is consistent with the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model (Demerouti et al., 2001), which posits that excessive job demands—such as heavy workloads—exhaust employees' mental and physical resources, ultimately resulting in burnout. It also aligns with Maslach and Leiter (2016), who emphasized that chronic overwork, insufficient recovery, and limited institutional support are among the strongest predictors of burnout in educational contexts. Similarly, Kinman and Wray (2013) highlighted workload management as central to sustaining faculty well-being and instructional quality.

Overall, the results underscore that workload is not merely a logistical concern but a critical determinant of faculty well-being, professional satisfaction, and long-term retention within the BISU system.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

Variables	1	2
1. Faculty Workload (FSW AVE)	—	
2. Professional and Social Commitment (PASC AVE)	.18	—

Decision: Do not reject the null hypothesis

Summary: There is no significant relationship between the faculty workload and the teaching efficacy.

Correlation Between Faculty Workload and Teaching Efficacy

The correlation analysis between Faculty Workload (FSW) and Teaching Efficacy (PASC) yielded a Pearson's r value of 0.181 with a p-value of 0.339, indicating a weak and statistically non-significant positive relationship. With a degrees of freedom (df) = 28, the result leads to the decision not to reject the null hypothesis, thereby concluding that faculty workload is not significantly related to their teaching efficacy.

This finding suggests that, within the BISU system, faculty members maintain high levels of teaching efficacy regardless of variations in their workload. Even though previous results indicated substantial workload pressures and a positive correlation between workload and burnout, these do not appear to diminish the faculty's perceived teaching effectiveness.

This result aligns with the research of Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), who emphasized that self-efficacy beliefs are rooted in personal mastery experiences and professional identity, and may remain resilient even under challenging conditions. Faculty members may view their teaching responsibilities as part of their professional commitment, using coping strategies or intrinsic motivation to sustain performance despite external demands.

Furthermore, Bandura's (1997) theory of self-efficacy supports this interpretation by noting that individuals with high efficacy tend to persevere and remain effective even under stress, provided they have a strong belief in their capabilities.

The absence of a significant correlation may also point to other intervening variables, such as institutional support, teaching experience, autonomy, or collegial relationships, which could mediate or buffer the impact of workload on teaching performance (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 201

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the impact of faculty workload in relation to burnout and teaching efficacy among the faculty members of the BISU system. The findings revealed three key insights. First, faculty members carry substantial workload responsibilities, which were found to have a strong and significant positive relationship with burnout. This suggests that increased workload is a critical contributor to emotional exhaustion and stress. Second, while workload was not significantly correlated with teaching efficacy, results showed that faculty members are able to sustain their sense of instructional competence despite demanding conditions. This resilience may be attributed to intrinsic motivation, mastery experiences, and professional commitment. Third, burnout demonstrated a significant negative relationship with teaching efficacy, indicating that although workload alone does not erode faculty performance, the psychological strain resulting from burnout can weaken teaching effectiveness.

Taken together, these results underscore the complex interplay of workload, burnout, and efficacy: workload increases burnout risk, but teaching efficacy remains stable unless compromised by the effects of burnout. This highlights both the resilience and vulnerability of faculty members, suggesting that institutional support mechanisms are vital in mitigating burnout and sustaining long-term teaching quality.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

Workload Management. The BISU administration should regularly review and equitably distribute teaching loads, committee assignments, and research expectations. Providing teaching assistants or streamlining administrative tasks can help reduce excessive demands.

Wellness and Preventive Programs. Institutional initiatives such as stress management workshops, faculty wellness programs, and resilience training can help faculty cope with workload pressures and prevent burnout.

Professional Support Systems. Establishing mentoring programs, peer-support groups, and counseling services can create a supportive environment that fosters both well-being and professional growth.

Policy Review and Development. Workload-related policies should be periodically reassessed to ensure alignment with both institutional goals and faculty capacity, incorporating feedback from faculty members themselves.

Sustaining Teaching Efficacy. Faculty development programs focusing on instructional innovation, reflective practice, and pedagogical training should be strengthened to reinforce teaching efficacy despite workload challenges.

Action Plan for Intervention. A comprehensive intervention framework may include:

Short-term actions: workload audits, flexible scheduling, and stress management seminars.

Medium-term actions: mentorship programs, faculty peer-learning circles, and recognition systems for effective teaching.

Long-term actions: institutionalized workload balancing policies, continuous faculty development initiatives, and dedicated wellness centers.

Proposed Action Plan for Intervention

Title: Balancing the Scales: The Impact of Faculty Workload in Relation to Burnout and Teaching Efficacy of BISU System

Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Persons Involved	Timeframe	Expected Outcomes
1. To assess and manage faculty workload equitably.	Conduct workload audits; develop fair workload distribution guidelines; assign teaching/research assistants where feasible.	Campus Directors, Deans, HR Office	Short-term (within 1 year) and continuous monitoring	Reduced workload disparities and improved faculty satisfaction.
2. To reduce faculty burnout through preventive and supportive measures.	Implement wellness programs (e.g., stress management workshops, mindfulness sessions, physical fitness initiatives).	HR Office, Guidance Counselors, Faculty Union	Short- to Medium-term (1–2 years)	Lower reported burnout levels and improved work-life balance.
3. To sustain and enhance faculty teaching efficacy.	Offer continuous professional development programs (e.g., pedagogy workshops, research mentoring, innovation in teaching).	College Deans, Faculty Development Office	Medium-term (2–3 years)	Improved instructional practices and reinforced teaching confidence.
4. To strengthen institutional support systems.	Establish faculty mentoring programs, peer-support groups, and counseling	Faculty Union, Guidance Counselors, Senior	Short- to Medium-term (1–2 years)	Strengthened collegiality, morale, and

	services.	Faculty		resilience.
5. To ensure long-term alignment of workload policies with institutional capacity.	Review and revise faculty workload policies periodically with faculty input; integrate feedback mechanisms into policy review.	University Administration, Policy Review Committee	Long-term (every 3–5 years)	Sustainable workload practices and enhanced institutional performance.

REFERENCES

Books

1. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
2. Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Student-teacher relationships as a source of risk and resilience in the development of school-ready skills. In K. McCartney & D. Phillips (Eds.), Handbook of early child development (pp. 179–194). Blackwell.
3. Holmegreen, L., et al. (2017). Conservation of resources theory. In The handbook of stress and health: A guide to research and practice. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118993811.ch27

Journals

1. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102
2. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000
3. Hong, J. Y. (2010). Pre-service and beginning teachers' professional identity and its relation to dropping out of the profession. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26(8), 1530–1543. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.003
4. Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. Teaching and Teacher Education, 21(4), 343–356.
5. Jumuad, P. A., et al. (2021). Teachers' workload in relation to burnout and work performance. International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review, 8(2), 48–53.
6. Landy, D., et al. (2019). Comparative estimation systems perform under severely limited workload capacity. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 92.
7. Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. Educational Leadership, 61(1), 6–13.
8. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry, 15(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311
9. Mullen, P. R., Backer, A., Chae, N., & Li, H. (2020). School counselors' work-related rumination as a predictor of burnout, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and work engagement. Professional School Counseling, 24(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X20957302
10. Pacaol, N. (2021). Teacher's workload intensification: A qualitative case study of its implications on teaching quality. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8(1), 43–60.
11. 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248
12. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26(4), 1059–1069. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001
13. Taris, T. W., Schreurs, P. J. G., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). Construct validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory–General Survey: A two-sample examination of its factor structure and correlates. Work & Stress, 15(3), 231–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370110089069
14. Thakur, I. (2018). Relationship between workload and burnout of special education teachers. Pakistan Journal of Distance & Online Learning, 4(1), 235–242.

15. Thiagarajan, P., et al. (2006). A confirmatory factor analysis of Reilly's Role Overload Scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66(4), 657–666.
16. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(7), 783–805.

CONFERENCES

(No explicit conference papers were listed; most are journals/books. If you meant CHED/CSC memos or UNESCO frameworks, those fit better under "Online/Reports")

Online / Reports / Policies

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. In Wellbeing: A complete reference guide. Wiley. https://www.isonderhouden.nl/doc/pdf/arnoldbakker/articles/articles_arnold_bakker_344.pdf

Civil Service Commission (CSC). (2020). Guidelines on faculty workload and performance standards.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2016). CHED Memorandum Order No. 52, series of 2016.

Department of Health (DOH). (2018). Mental Health Act (Republic Act No. 11036).

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). Mind Garden. https://www.mindgarden.com/117-maslach-burnout-inventory-mbi

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). Education 2030 framework for action.

Balancing The Scales: The Impact of Faculty Workload in Relation to Burnout and Teaching Efficacy of Bisu System

Dear Respondents,

I, RIZA BELTRAN-SALIPONG is currently working on my study entitled, **"BALANCING THE SCALES: THE IMPACT OF FACULTY WORKLOAD IN RELATION TO BURNOUT AND TEACHING EFFICACY".** In connection, may I request your outmost cooperation to answer and rate each item of this questionnaire honestly. Your response will be used for research purposes only and the responses will always be kept confidential. Thank you very much.

Name _____ Gender: _____ Year and Course: _____

Specialization:_____ Designation/s: _____ Teaching Load _____

Part I. FACULTY WORKLOAD SCALE.

Instruction: This questionnaire attempt to measure the assess the work overload of faculty. Refer to the guide below in choosing your option. It is important that you honestly answer each item. Please do not leave any item unchecked. Rest assured that your individual information will be treated with confidentiality.

5 - Strongly Agree

4 – Agree

3 – Neutral

2 – Disagree

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

1 – Strongly Disagree

Item	5	4	3	2	1
1. I have to do things that I do not really have the time and energy for.	2.87				
2. There are too many demands on my time.	3.13				
3. I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me.					
4. I cannot ever seem to catch up.					
5. I do not ever seem to have any time for myself.					
6. There are times when I cannot meet everyone's expectations.					
7. Many times I have to cancel commitments.					
8. I seem to have more commitments to overcome than other co/workers s member of the family or parent I know.					
9. I have to prepare priority lists to get all the things done. Otherwise I forget because I have so much to do.					
10. I feel I have to do things hastily and may be less careful to get everything done.					

Part II. FACULTY BURNOUT SCALE

Instruction: This questionnaire attempt to measure the Burnout scale of faculty. Refer to the guide below in choosing your option. It is important that you honestly answer each item. Please do not leave any item unchecked. Rest assured that your individual information will be treated with confidentiality.

5 - Strongly Agree

4 – Agree

3 – Neutral

2 – Disagree

1 – Strongly Disagree

ITEM	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1 I am looking forward teaching in the future					
2. I feel depressed of my teaching experiences.					
3. I get adequate praise from my supervisor for the job well done					

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

4. The teaching day seems to drag on and on.					
5. I am glad that I selected teaching as a career.					
6.The student's act like a bunch of animals					
7. My physical illness may be related to the stress in this job					
8. I feel that the administrator willing to help me with classroom problems, should they arise.					
9. I find hard to calm down after a day of teaching					
10.Teaching is more fulfilling than I expected					
11.I believed that my effort in the classroom is unappreciated by the administrator					
12.If I had it do all it over again, I would not become a school Teacher					
13.I feel that I could do a much better job of teaching if only the problem confronting me were not so great.					
14.The stresses in this job is more that I can bear					
15.My supervisor give me more criticism than praise					
16. Most of my students are descent people					
17. Most students come to school ready to learn.					
18. I feel that the administrator will not help me with classroom difficulties					
19. I look forward to each teaching day.					
20. The administrator blames for classroom problem					
21. Students come to school with bad attitudes					

Jumuad, Perlito A. et.al (2021). Teachers' workload in relation to burnout and work performance. International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review Vol.8 (2), pp. 48-53

Part II. FACULTY TEACHING EFFICACY

Instruction: This questionnaire attempt to measure the Burnout scale of faculty. Refer to the guide below in choosing your option. It is important that you honestly answer each item. Please do not leave any item unchecked. Rest assured that your individual information will be treated with confidentiality.

5 - Strongly Agree

4 – Agree

3 – Neutral

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

2 – Disagree

1 – Strongly Disagree

ITEM	5	4	3	2	1
I. TEACHING SKILLS					
D. Preparation					
6. Identifies specific needs, interest, and capacities of individual students					
7. Analyzes and identifies specific learning task					
8. Creates and tries out appropriate strategies and materials that meet needs of students					
9. Prepares adequately for the day's learning activities.					
10. Shows evidence of professional and cultural growth					
E. Classroom Techniques					
8. Provides varied learning experiences for the development of communication					
9. Selects appropriate available community resources for teaching-learning process					
10. Selects, prepares and utilizes instructional materials effectively					
1. Motivates the students regarding the lessons and task questions for critical thinking					
12. Provides maximum involvement of students in the learning interaction					
13. Provides a permissive and stimulating atmosphere that encouragement students.					
14. Utilizes evaluation results as a basis for improving instruction.					
F. Understanding of Subject Matter.					
6. Show evidence of mastery of subject matter					
7. Communicates ideas effectively					
Is able to effectively apply the subject to present situation and to life general					
9. Make sure students understand basic ideas of the lesson					
0. Gives assignment that the students understand, help the learn and is					

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

related to the objectives					
II. TEACHER STUDENTS RELATIONSHIP					
Shows interest in student's problems and needs and makes provision for these					
7. Stimulates and compliments students to elicit positive and active participation.					
. Functions effectively as a member of the classroom learning group.					
9. Helps students develop self-discipline in and through the learning process.					
10. Sets examples in moral and ethical behavior to students and in the community.					
III. MANAGEMENT SKILLS					
6. Initiates/ conducts /participates in research/meetings/collaborative endeavor for improvement of teaching-learning.					
7. Prepares adequately for the days learning activities					
8. Starts learning activities promptly					
9. Administers tests effectively and returns corrected papers/work promptly.					
. Achieves teaching objectives to the optimum based on lesson/activity within time.					
IV. EVALUATION SKILLS					
6. Uses specific criteria for the accurate evaluation of individual performance.					
7. Selects/involves and utilizes criterion-reference test and other appropriate evaluation					
8. Makes a continuing assessment of students' achievement					
9. Analyzes and interprets evaluation results skillfully.					
10. Utilizes evaluation results as a basis for improving instructions.					
V. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL COMPETENCIES					
5. Sets the example in moral and ethical behavior to students and the community.					
6. Shows honesty and integrity in all his/her activities.					
7. Shows evidence of professional and cultural growth					

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

Sosas, Rowena V., et.,al. (2022). Workload and Teaching Efficiency of High School Teachers in Southern Baptist College, Incorporated Mlang, Cotabato, Philippines. OSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)e-ISSN: 2320–7388, p- ISSN: 2320-737x Volume 13, Issue 1 Ser.