

# Professional Development Opportunities and Organizational Commitment on the Workload Demands of Private School Teachers

Floreda Cahuan Dumandan., Dr. James L. Paglinawan

Department of Education, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110400140>

Received: 20 April 2026; Accepted: 25 April 2026; Published: 14 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the relationship among professional development opportunities, organizational commitment, and workload demands of private school teachers in Bukidnon during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it sought to determine the levels of professional development opportunities, organizational commitment, and workload demands, as well as to identify their significant relationships and predictive influences. Employing a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design, data were gathered from 300 private school teachers using adopted standardized survey questionnaires. The collected data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple regression analyses. Findings revealed that teachers perceived a high level of professional development opportunities across instructional, scientific, personal, and organizational domains, indicating favorable access to professional growth activities. In terms of organizational commitment, teachers demonstrated moderate levels of affective, continuance, and normative commitment, suggesting a reasonable sense of attachment and responsibility toward their institutions, albeit influenced by existing conditions. Meanwhile, teachers reported high workload demands in terms of time, quantitative, and qualitative aspects, signifying that although workloads are manageable, they remain consistently challenging. Correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between workload demands and both professional development opportunities and organizational commitment. This implies that increased engagement in professional growth and stronger organizational attachment are associated with heightened perceptions of workload demands. Furthermore, regression analysis revealed that normative commitment, affective commitment, and selected dimensions of professional development—particularly instructional, organizational, and personal development—significantly predict workload demands. These findings suggest that as teachers become more professionally involved and organizationally committed, their responsibilities and perceived workload likewise increase.

**Keywords:** normative commitment, instructional development, organizational development, personal development, affective commitment

## INTRODUCTION

Teachers play a critical role in sustaining educational quality, yet their effectiveness is increasingly shaped by the combined influence of professional development opportunities, organizational commitment, and workload demands. In private school settings, teachers are expected not only to deliver instruction but also to engage in continuous professional growth and organizational responsibilities, which may intensify their workload.

Professional development enhances teachers' instructional competence and adaptability, particularly across instructional, scientific, personal, and organizational domains. However, increased engagement in these activities may also expand teachers' roles, contributing to higher workload demands. At the same time, organizational commitment—whether affective, continuance, or normative—influences teachers' willingness to remain in their institutions and accept additional responsibilities.

In the Philippine context, teachers face increasing workload demands due to administrative tasks and evolving educational expectations. A study by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (2019) highlights that teachers often spend significant time on non-instructional duties, while the Department of Education (2020)

emphasizes the need to rationalize workload to protect teacher well-being. Although professional development is guided by national standards (Department of Education, 2017), limited research has examined how these factors interact in private school contexts, particularly in provincial areas such as Bukidnon.

Grounded in relevant organizational and educational theories, this study examines the relationship among professional development opportunities, organizational commitment, and workload demands of private school teachers in Bukidnon during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it aims to determine the levels of these variables, examine their relationships, and identify the predictors of workload demands.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive–correlational quantitative research design to examine the relationship among professional development opportunities, organizational commitment, and workload demands of private school teachers in Bukidnon during School Year 2025–2026. The respondents consisted of 300 private school teachers from selected private educational institutions in the province, chosen through random sampling to ensure adequate representation across participating schools. Data were collected using three adopted and standardized survey questionnaires measuring professional development opportunities (instructional, scientific field, personal, and organizational development), organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative commitment), and workload demands (time, quantitative, and qualitative). Prior to actual data collection, the instruments were pilot-tested and demonstrated excellent reliability, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.908 for professional development opportunities, 0.959 for organizational commitment, and 0.940 for workload demands. A five-point Likert scale was used for all instruments. Formal permission to conduct the study was secured from school administrators, and participation was voluntary, with confidentiality of responses assured. The gathered data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the levels of the variables, Pearson product–moment correlation to examine the relationships among them, and multiple regression analysis to identify which variables significantly predicted teachers’ workload demands.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter contains the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data gathered on the Teachers’ levels of Professional Development Opportunities, Organizational Commitment, and Workload Demands. The order of presentation is based on the order of specific objectives of the study.

### Professional Development Opportunities

#### Instructional Development

The results in Table 1 show that teachers generally perceive a high level of professional development opportunities in terms of instructional development, as indicated by an overall mean of 4.02, a standard deviation of 0.53, and a descriptive rating of Agree, which is qualitatively interpreted as High Opportunity. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a high level of consistency in teachers’ perceptions. Among the indicators, the highest-rated items were the need for knowledge about designing and using instructional materials ( $M = 4.35$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ , Agree), following innovations in information and communication technologies and applying them in lessons ( $M = 4.34$ ,  $SD = 0.72$ , Agree), and the need for knowledge about using technology for teaching purposes ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ , Agree), all of which were interpreted as High Opportunity. On the other hand, the lowest rated indicator was the ability to teach gifted children or children with learning disabilities ( $M = 3.32$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ , Neutral), which was qualitatively interpreted as Moderate Opportunity. The relatively higher standard deviation for this item indicates greater variability in teachers’ responses, suggesting differences

The findings reveal that teachers perceive a high level of professional development opportunities in instructional development ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 0.53$ ). High ratings were observed in competencies related to instructional material design, integration of information and communication technologies, and application of varied teaching strategies. These results indicate that teachers are generally well-supported in enhancing their instructional practices and adapting to evolving pedagogical demands.

However, the comparatively lower rating in teaching gifted learners and students with learning disabilities ( $M = 3.32$ ) highlights a critical gap in inclusive education competencies. The higher variability in this indicator suggests unequal access to specialized training and institutional support across schools. This disparity implies that while general instructional competencies are well developed, targeted training in differentiated instruction and inclusive practices remains insufficient.

These findings suggest that professional development programs are effective in strengthening core instructional skills but must be expanded to address diverse learner needs. Without such support, disparities in teacher preparedness may persist, potentially affecting equitable learning outcomes.

Table 1. Mean scores of the teachers' level of professional development opportunities in terms of instructional development.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I need knowledge about designing and using instructional materials.	4.35	0.78	Agree	High Opportunity
I follow the innovations in information and communication technologies and apply them in my lessons.	4.34	0.72	Agree	High Opportunity
I need knowledge about using technology for teaching purposes.	4.33	0.86	Agree	High Opportunity
I would like to learn different teaching methods to motivate students and to encourage them participate in classroom activities.	4.26	0.82	Agree	High Opportunity
I can easily use various teaching strategies in my lessons.	4.12	0.75	Agree	High Opportunity
I can always motivate my students and encourage them participate in the classroom activities.	4.06	0.76	Agree	High Opportunity
I can easily improve my students thinking abilities.	3.97	0.74	Agree	High Opportunity
I am successful in teaching environment and classroom preparation activities.	3.94	0.74	Agree	High Opportunity
I have enough knowledge about assessment and evaluation.	3.91	0.79	Agree	High Opportunity
I do not have any problems in preparing lesson plans in accordance with learning outcomes in the curriculum.	3.84	0.85	Agree	High Opportunity
I do not have difficulty in preventing student interventions that negatively affect the lesson.	3.79	0.89	Agree	High Opportunity
I do not have difficulty in teaching gifted children or children with learning disability.	3.32	1.00	Neutral	Moderate Opportunity
Overall Mean	4.02	0.53	Agree	High Opportunity

Legend:

Range:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Opportunity
3:51-4:50	Agree (A)	High Opportunity
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Opportunity
1:51-2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Opportunity
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Opportunity

**Scientific Field Development**

Table 2 shows that teachers perceive a high level of professional development opportunities in terms of scientific field development, with an overall mean of 3.83, a standard deviation of 0.58, and a descriptive rating of Agree, which is qualitatively interpreted as High Opportunity. The standard deviation indicates a moderate level of agreement among teachers, suggesting generally similar but not uniform experiences in scientific development opportunities.

Table 2. Mean scores of the teachers' level of professional development opportunities in terms of scientific field development.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I want to learn the research methods and statistical research techniques related to my field.	4.23	0.80	Agree	High Opportunity
I need knowledge on how to take part in national and international projects and activities related to my field.	4.05	0.81	Agree	High Opportunity
I am provided with opportunities to attend seminars, workshops, or conferences relevant to my field.	3.91	0.93	Agree	High Opportunity
I know how to take part in projects and activities related to my field or to benefit from research funds.	3.83	0.78	Agree	High Opportunity
I am informed about recent trends, innovations, and advancements.	3.82	0.78	Agree	High Opportunity
I receive adequate guidance or mentoring from experts to develop my research skills in my field.	3.76	0.87	Agree	High Opportunity
I am encouraged to publish research outputs (e.g., journals, conference papers) related to my field.	3.76	0.84	Agree	High Opportunity
I am given opportunities to collaborate with other researchers or professionals within my field	3.68	0.92	Agree	High Opportunity
I have enough knowledge about scientific research methods.	3.67	0.81	Agree	High Opportunity

I have access to updated research resources (e.g., journals, databases, research tools) related to my field.	3.57	0.92	Agree	High Opportunity
Overall Mean	3.83	0.58	Agree	High Opportunity

Legend:

Range:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Opportunity
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Opportunity
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Opportunity
1:51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Opportunity
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Opportunity

Teachers also reported a high level of professional development opportunities in scientific field development ( $M = 3.83$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ), particularly in learning research methods and statistical techniques. This reflects a strong recognition of the importance of research competence in professional practice.

Nevertheless, relatively lower ratings in mentoring, collaboration, and access to research resources indicate variability in institutional support systems. While teachers demonstrate interest in research engagement, opportunities for sustained scholarly involvement are not consistently available.

This suggests that professional development in research should move beyond individual capacity-building toward structured institutional support, including mentoring programs, research funding access, and collaborative networks. Strengthening these mechanisms can promote a more consistent research culture and enhance evidence-based teaching practices.

### Personal Development

Table 3 shows that teachers perceive a high level of professional development opportunities in terms of personal development, with an overall mean of 4.02, a standard deviation of 0.60, and a descriptive rating of Agree, which is qualitatively interpreted as High Opportunity. The results further indicate a high level of professional development opportunities in personal development ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ). Teachers expressed strong interest in improving communication skills, stress management, and emotional regulation, highlighting the importance of personal competencies in sustaining professional effectiveness.

Table 3. Mean scores of the teachers' level of professional development opportunities in terms of personal development.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I would like to take support or training about career planning and time management	4.13	1.88	Agree	High Opportunity
I believe I need to enhance my verbal and nonverbal communication skills for professional purposes.	4.23	0.84	Agree	High Opportunity

I would like to receive training to improve my stress management and coping skills at work.	4.18	0.82	Agree	High Opportunity
I feel the need to improve my emotional regulation and anger management skills in professional settings.	4.06	0.82	Agree	High Opportunity
I need opportunities to develop my self-confidence and professional self-awareness.	3.99	0.86	Agree	High Opportunity
I am competent in career planning and time management skills related to my profession.	3.96	0.83	Agree	High Opportunity
I have a strong sense of self-awareness and confidence in my professional role.	3.96	0.81	Agree	High Opportunity
I demonstrate effective verbal and nonverbal communication skills in my professional interactions.	3.91	0.72	Agree	High Opportunity
I am able to control my emotions and manage anger effectively in work-related situations	3.91	0.78	Agree	High Opportunity
I am able to handle work-related stress in a healthy and productive manner.	3.88	0.80	Agree	High Opportunity
Overall Mean	4.02	0.60	Agree	High Opportunity

Legend:

<u>Range:</u>	<u>Descriptive Rating</u>	<u>Qualitative Interpretation</u>
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Opportunity
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Opportunity
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Opportunity
1:51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Opportunity
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Opportunity

Notably, the higher variability in career planning and time management suggests differences in teachers' preparedness in managing professional responsibilities. While some teachers demonstrate confidence in these areas, others require additional support.

These findings underscore the importance of integrating personal development into professional training programs. Enhancing teachers' emotional resilience, communication, and self-management skills is essential not only for performance but also for long-term well-being, particularly in high-demand work environments.

### Organizational Development

Table 4 shows that teachers perceive a high level of professional development opportunities in terms of organizational development, with an overall mean of 3.98, a standard deviation of 0.63, and a descriptive rating of Agree, which is qualitatively interpreted as High Opportunity. Teachers perceived a high level of professional development opportunities in organizational development (M = 3.98, SD = 0.63), particularly in areas related to

teamwork, organizational processes, and problem-solving. This indicates that teachers are generally capable of functioning effectively within institutional structures.

However, slightly higher variability in leadership-related indicators suggests unequal opportunities for leadership engagement and decision-making participation. While teachers are competent in collaborative roles, not all are equally involved in organizational leadership.

This implies that schools should expand leadership development initiatives and promote shared governance practices. Providing more teachers with opportunities to participate in decision-making can strengthen organizational commitment and institutional effectiveness.

Table 5. Mean scores of the teachers' level of professional development opportunities in terms of organizational development.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I need further orientation or training regarding the organizational structure and operational processes of the school.	4.08	0.81	Agree	High Opportunity
I feel the need to improve my teamwork skills to effectively meet the school's organizational goals.	4.06	0.81	Agree	High Opportunity
I need opportunities to improve my decision-making and problem-solving skills within the organization.	4.04	0.84	Agree	High Opportunity
I would like to receive training on school policies, rules, and administrative procedures.	4.03	0.85	Agree	High Opportunity
I consider myself effective in working collaboratively with teams within the institution.	4.00	0.79	Agree	High Opportunity
I need professional development opportunities related to leadership and organizational roles in the school.	3.98	0.85	Agree	High Opportunity
I have sufficient understanding of the school's organizational structure, culture, and work processes.	3.97	0.63	Agree	High Opportunity
I am familiar with and able to comply with the school's policies and administrative procedures.	3.93	0.74	Agree	High Opportunity
I am capable of taking leadership responsibilities when required in the organization.	3.84	0.83	Agree	High Opportunity
I am able to make sound decisions and contribute to problem-solving in organizational matters.	3.83	0.86	Agree	High Opportunity
Overall Mean	3.98	0.63	Agree	High Opportunity

Legend:

Range:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Opportunity

3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Opportunity
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Opportunity
1.51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Opportunity
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Opportunity

**Summary of Professional Development Opportunities**

Table 5. Summary of the teachers’ level of professional development opportunities.

Professional Opportunities	Development	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Instructional Development		4.02	0.53	Agree	High Opportunity
Personal Development		4.02	0.6	Agree	High Opportunity
Organizational Development		3.98	0.63	Agree	High Opportunity
Scientific Field Development		3.83	0.58	Agree	High Opportunity
Overall Mean		3.96	0.45	Agree	High Opportunity

Legend:

Range:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Opportunity
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Opportunity
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Opportunity
1.51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Opportunity
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Opportunity

Professional development opportunities across instructional, scientific, personal, and organizational domains were rated as high ( $M = 3.96$ ,  $SD = 0.45$ ), indicating that teachers generally experience favorable access to professional growth. However, the relatively lower rating in scientific field development suggests that research-related opportunities are less consistently available. This imbalance highlights the need for a more integrated and equitable approach to professional development that ensures holistic teacher growth across all domains.

These findings imply that schools have generally established effective professional development structures that address multiple dimensions of teachers’ growth. However, the comparatively lower rating and greater variability in Scientific Field Development indicate the need to strengthen research-focused opportunities to ensure balanced professional growth. Enhancing access to mentoring, research resources, and scholarly collaboration can help maintain consistency across all domains and support holistic teacher development that benefits both instructional practice and institutional advancement.

The overall high opportunity ratings align with Mallillin and Laurel (2022), who demonstrated that well-designed professional development programs positively influence instructional quality and student learning outcomes. At the same time, the relatively lower score in scientific field development reflects the disparities

noted by Constantino and Antonio (2025), who found that teachers in rural areas often face fewer opportunities for scientific growth. These studies affirm that while PDOs are effective in enhancing teacher competence, institutional support and equitable access remain essential for sustaining balanced professional growth.

**Organizational Commitment**

**Affective Commitment**

Table 6 presents the teachers’ level of organizational commitment in terms of affective commitment. The results show an overall mean of 3.49, a standard deviation of 0.58, and a descriptive rating of Neutral, which is qualitatively interpreted as Moderate Commitment.

Table 7. Mean scores of the teachers’ level of organizational commitment in terms of affective commitment.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	3.88	0.87	Agree	High Commitment
I feel proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.	3.95	0.96	Agree	High Commitment
I feel emotionally connected to this organization.	3.83	0.84	Agree	High Commitment
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside the organization.	3.79	0.88	Agree	High Commitment
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	3.75	0.97	Agree	High Commitment
I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.	3.60	0.95	Agree	High Commitment
I think that I could easily become as emotionally attached to another organization as I am to this one.	3.52	0.89	Agree	High Commitment
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.	2.93	1.18	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	2.89	1.19	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I do not feel like “part of the family” in this organization.	2.77	1.18	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Overall Mean	3.49	0.58	Neutral	Moderate Commitment

Legend:

Range:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Commitment

3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Commitment
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Commitment
1.51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Commitment
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Commitment

Teachers demonstrated moderate affective commitment ( $M = 3.49, SD = 0.58$ ), characterized by feelings of pride and identification with their institutions. However, lower ratings in belongingness-related indicators suggest that deeper emotional attachment is not consistently experienced. This indicates a distinction between surface-level identification (e.g., pride in affiliation) and deeper emotional integration within the organization. While teachers value their institutions, not all feel a strong sense of belonging. Strengthening collegial relationships, recognition systems, and inclusive organizational cultures may enhance affective commitment and promote stronger emotional engagement.

### Continuance Commitment

Table 7 presents the teachers' level of organizational commitment in terms of continuance commitment. The results show an overall mean of 3.41, a standard deviation of 0.69, and a descriptive rating of Neutral, which is qualitatively interpreted as Moderate Commitment. The highest-rated indicators include the difficulty of leaving the organization even if one wanted to ( $M = 3.57, SD = 1.01$ ) and staying with the organization as a matter of necessity as much as desire ( $M = 3.53, SD = 0.99$ ), both descriptively rated as Agree and interpreted as High Commitment.

Table . Mean scores of the teachers' level of organizational commitment in terms of continuance commitment.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
It would be very difficult for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	3.57	1.01	Agree	High Commitment
At this point, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as it is a matter of desire.	3.53	0.99	Agree	High Commitment
One serious consequence of leaving this organization would be the lack of available job opportunities elsewhere.	3.50	1.05	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice, as another organization may not provide the same overall benefits.	3.49	0.96	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I believe that the benefits I receive from this organization would be difficult to replace if I left.	3.45	1.03	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my organization at this time.	3.40	1.06	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I stay with this organization largely because the costs associated with leaving are too high for me at present.	3.39	0.97	Neutral	Moderate Commitment

I feel that I have very few viable alternatives if I were to leave this organization.	3.35	1.00	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I am not afraid of the possible negative consequences of quitting my job without having another one lined up.	3.28	1.15	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Leaving my organization now would not involve significant personal or financial costs.	3.15	1.06	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Overall Mean	3.41	0.69	Neutral	Moderate Commitment

Legend:

Range:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Commitment
3:51-4:50	Agree (A)	High Commitment
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Commitment
1:51-2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Commitment
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Commitment

The findings show moderate continuance commitment ( $M = 3.41$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ), with notable variability across respondents. Teachers acknowledged practical considerations such as job security, benefits, and limited alternatives as factors influencing their decision to stay. This suggests that continuance commitment is shaped largely by contextual conditions, including economic constraints, employment opportunities, and personal responsibilities. Teachers who remain primarily due to necessity may experience reduced motivation and increased vulnerability to burnout. These findings highlight the limitations of reliance on necessity-based retention. Schools must move beyond structural constraints and foster more meaningful engagement to ensure sustainable commitment.

### Normative Commitment

Table 8 presents the teachers' level of organizational commitment in terms of normative commitment. The results show an overall mean of 3.47, a standard deviation of 0.65, and a descriptive rating of Neutral, which is qualitatively interpreted as Moderate Commitment. Indicators reflecting a sense of obligation and loyalty obtained relatively higher mean scores, including the belief that staying with the organization is the right thing to do ( $M = 3.63$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), feeling an obligation to give back to the organization ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ), and a sense of duty due to institutional investment ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ), all rated as Agree and interpreted as High Commitment.

Table 9. Mean scores of the teachers' level of organizational commitment in terms of normative commitment.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I believe that employees today move from one organization to another more often than they should.	3.63	0.96	Agree	High Commitment

I believe that staying with my organization is the right thing to do, not just a practical decision.	3.63	0.85	Agree	High Commitment
I feel an obligation to give back to my organization by continuing my service.	3.60	0.97	Agree	High Commitment
I feel a sense of duty to remain with my organization because it has invested in me.	3.55	0.88	Agree	High Commitment
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is my belief that loyalty is important and that I have a moral obligation to remain.	3.52	0.94	Agree	High Commitment
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now, even if doing so benefited me personally.	3.44	0.94	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I think that leaving one organization for another is not unethical, even when one feels some responsibility to stay.	3.40	0.98	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Even if I were offered a better job elsewhere, I would feel that it would not be right to leave my organization.	3.38	1.05	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I do not believe that a person has a moral obligation to remain loyal to his or her organization.	3.33	1.08	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
I do not feel any moral responsibility to stay with my organization if another opportunity arises.	3.27	1.14	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Overall Mean	3.47	0.65	Neutral	Moderate Commitment

Legend:

Scale:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Commitment
3:51-4:50	Agree (A)	High Commitment
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Commitment
1:51-2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Commitment
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Commitment

Teachers also exhibited moderate normative commitment ( $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ), reflecting a sense of obligation and loyalty to their institutions. This commitment appears to be influenced by cultural values, professional identity, and institutional investment. In the Philippine context, teaching is often viewed as a vocation associated with service and responsibility, which may reinforce teachers' moral obligation to remain committed. However, this obligation is balanced by personal career considerations, indicating that normative commitment is not deeply internalized across all respondents. These findings suggest that while teachers recognize the value of loyalty, institutions must strengthen value-based connections and shared purpose to sustain long-term commitment.

### Summary of Organizational Commitment

Table 9 presents the summary of teachers’ organizational commitment in terms of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The results show that all three dimensions obtained moderate levels of commitment, with mean scores ranging from 3.41 to 3.49. Affective commitment recorded the highest mean ( $M = 3.49$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ), followed by normative commitment ( $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ) and continuance commitment ( $M = 3.41$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ).

Table 10. Summary of the teachers’ level of professional development opportunities.

Organizational Commitment	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Affective Commitment	3.49	0.58	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Normative Commitment	3.47	0.65	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Continuance Commitment	3.41	0.69	Neutral	Moderate Commitment
Overall Mean	3.46	0.53	Neutral	Moderate Commitment

Legend:

Scale:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Commitment
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Commitment
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Commitment
1.51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Commitment
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Commitment

The overall mean of 3.46, with a standard deviation of 0.53 and a descriptive rating of Neutral, is qualitatively interpreted as Moderate Commitment, indicating that teachers exhibit a balanced but not strongly entrenched attachment to their institutions. Commitment appears to be shaped by a combination of emotional, practical, and moral factors, none of which dominate strongly. Strengthening organizational culture, recognition, and support systems is essential to deepen commitment and enhance retention.

The overall moderate ratings resonate with Ballenas et al. (2023), who found that compliance with CPD is influenced by organizational learning culture and managerial support, underscoring the role of institutional environment in shaping commitment. Similarly, Ramada (2020) highlighted that professional development integrated with recognition and performance evaluation enhances job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. These studies affirm that while teachers show moderate commitment, stronger institutional investment in culture and recognition is essential to deepen organizational bonds.

### Workload Demands

#### Time Demands

Teachers reported high workload demands in terms of time ( $M = 3.86$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ), with generally structured schedules and reasonable deadlines. However, variability in responses related to sudden assignments indicates that unplanned tasks contribute to time pressure. This suggests that while overall time management systems are

effective, unpredictability in task allocation remains a challenge. Reducing last-minute assignments and improving planning processes may enhance time efficiency.

Table 10. Mean scores of the teachers' level of workload demands in terms of time.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The deadlines given for my tasks are reasonable.	4.04	0.83	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I am given sufficient time to complete my assigned work.	4.04	0.81	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I am able to complete my tasks within the expected time frame.	3.93	0.81	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
My workload deadlines allow me to maintain work quality.	3.92	0.82	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I can manage my time effectively to finish my work responsibilities.	3.91	0.86	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
My work schedule allows me to complete tasks without rushing.	3.86	0.88	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The time allocated for my work matches the difficulty of the tasks.	3.79	0.87	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I seldom experience time pressure when completing my work.	3.77	0.88	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I rarely receive tasks that must be completed in an unreasonably short time.	3.69	0.96	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Sudden work assignments do not significantly disrupt my planned schedule.	3.63	0.94	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Overall Mean	3.86	0.64	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand

Legend:

Scale:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Workload Demand
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Workload Demand
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Workload Demand
1:51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Workload Demand
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Workload Demand

The findings align with Hakanen et al. (2016), who emphasized that time pressure is a major predictor of teacher stress and burnout, particularly when educators juggle multiple responsibilities beyond classroom instruction. Similarly, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017) found that unreasonable deadlines and sudden assignments are strongly associated with emotional exhaustion, reinforcing the lower ratings teachers gave to indicators on unexpected tasks. Alves et al. (2019) further confirmed that even teachers with strong time management skills struggle when institutional demands exceed available time resources, especially during curriculum reforms. These studies affirm that structured scheduling and realistic deadlines are essential in sustaining teacher well-being and performance.

**Quantitative Demands**

Table 11. Mean scores of the teachers’ level of workload demands in terms of quantitative demands.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The amount of work assigned to me is manageable.	3.97	0.79	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The number of tasks assigned to me allows me to maintain work efficiency.	3.92	0.82	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I am rarely given tasks beyond my assigned duties and responsibilities.	3.90	0.77	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
My workload allows me to perform my duties effectively.	3.89	0.83	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The volume of work assigned to me is reasonable	3.85	0.81	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
My work assignments are distributed fairly.	3.83	0.85	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I can handle my workload without feeling overwhelmed.	3.81	0.84	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I am not overloaded with excessive work responsibilities.	3.79	0.89	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The number of tasks I handle does not exceed my work capacity.	3.79	0.80	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I can complete all assigned tasks within my working hours.	3.78	0.91	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Overall Mean	3.85	0.68	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand

Legend:

Scale:	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Workload Demand

3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Workload Demand
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Workload Demand
1.51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Workload Demand
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Workload Demand

The results also indicate high quantitative workload demands ( $M = 3.85$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ), reflecting the substantial volume of tasks assigned to teachers. Despite this, teachers generally perceive their workload as manageable. This pattern suggests a high level of professional capacity and adaptability among teachers. However, sustained exposure to high task volume may lead to cumulative stress over time, particularly if additional responsibilities continue to increase.

### Qualitative Demands

Table 12. Mean scores of the teachers' level of workload demands in terms of qualitative demands.

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
There is good teamwork in completing work tasks.	4.12	0.80	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Cooperation among colleagues helps me accomplish my work effectively.	4.11	0.80	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Collaboration between departments supports my work performance.	4.09	0.79	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The quality of work expected from me is achievable with my skills and resources.	4.05	0.81	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I am confident in my ability to complete the tasks assigned to me.	4.04	0.74	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
My work assignments allow me to use my professional competencies.	4.02	0.76	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
I clearly understand how to perform my assigned duties.	4.00	0.84	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The level of difficulty of my work is appropriate for my position.	3.93	0.82	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
My ideas and suggestions are considered when completing work tasks.	3.93	0.85	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
The tasks assigned to me match my skills and qualifications	3.92	0.79	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Overall Mean	4.02	0.65	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand

Legend:

<u>Range</u>	<u>Descriptive Rating</u>	<u>Qualitative Interpretation</u>
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Workload Demand
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Workload Demand
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Workload Demand
1:51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Workload Demand
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Workload Demand

Teachers experienced high qualitative workload demands ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ), particularly in areas requiring collaboration, professional judgment, and alignment of tasks with competencies. Strong collegial support and teamwork appear to facilitate the management of complex tasks. This indicates that qualitative demands, while high, are supported by positive organizational conditions. Maintaining collaborative environments is therefore essential in ensuring that complex work remains manageable and professionally rewarding.

**Summary of workload demands**

Table 14. Summary of the teachers’ level of workload demands.

Organizational Commitment	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Qualitative	4.02	0.65	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Time	3.86	0.64	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Quantitative	3.85	0.68	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand
Overall Mean	3.91	0.57	Strongly Agree	High Workload Demand

Legend:

<u>Range:</u>	<u>Descriptive Rating</u>	<u>Qualitative Interpretation</u>
4:51-5:00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High Workload Demand
3:51:4:50	Agree (A)	High Workload Demand
2:51-3:50	Neutral (N)	Moderate Workload Demand
1:51:2:50	Disagree (D)	Low Workload Demand
1:00-1:50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low Workload Demand

Workload demands were rated as high ( $M = 3.91$ ,  $SD = 0.57$ ) across all dimensions. This indicates that teachers consistently experience substantial professional demands requiring sustained effort and competence. Addressing workload requires a holistic approach that considers not only task volume but also time constraints and qualitative expectations.

These results imply that workload demands should be addressed in a comprehensive and balanced manner, considering not only the volume of tasks but also time constraints and qualitative expectations. Schools should

ensure equitable distribution of responsibilities, realistic scheduling, and continued support for collaborative practices. Addressing workload demands holistically can help sustain teaching quality, reduce work strain, and promote teachers’ well-being and long-term professional engagement.

The consistently high workload ratings across time, quantitative, and qualitative dimensions resonate with the broader literature. Geiger and Pivovarova (2018) and Van Droogenbroeck et al. (2016) emphasized that workload pressures are persistent challenges that affect both efficiency and well-being. Meanwhile, Vangrieken et al. (2017) and Ryan & Deci (2020) highlighted that collaboration and recognition can mitigate these pressures, sustaining teacher engagement and satisfaction. Alves et al. (2019) further confirmed that institutional support and balanced workload policies are vital in ensuring that demands remain manageable. These studies affirm that addressing workload demands holistically through equitable distribution, realistic deadlines, and collaborative structures supports teaching quality and professional fulfillment.

**Relationship of Professional Development Opportunities, Organizational Commitment, and Workload Demands**

The correlation results in Table 14 show that workload demands are significantly related to both professional development opportunities and organizational commitment, with all correlations significant at the 0.01 level. The strongest relationships were observed with professional development opportunities ( $r=.489, p=.000$ ) and organizational development ( $r=.419, p=.000$ ). Organizational commitment also showed a notable correlation ( $r=.415, p=.000$ ), with affective (.368), continuance (.299), and normative (.376) commitments all moderately linked to workload demands.

Table 14. Correlation of Professional Development Opportunities, Organization Commitment, and Workload Demands.

Workload Demands	r-value	p-value
Professional Development Opportunities	.489**	.000
Instructional Development	.386**	.000
Scientific Field Development	.306**	.000
Personal Development	.388**	.000
Organizational Development	.419**	.000
Organizational Commitment	.415**	.000
Affective Commitment	.368**	.000
Continuance Commitment	.299**	.000
Normative Commitment	.376**	.000

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings suggest that teachers’ perceptions of workload demands are closely tied to the availability of professional development and their level of organizational commitment. When institutions provide structured opportunities for instructional, personal, and organizational growth, teachers are better able to manage workload pressures. Likewise, higher levels of organizational commitment, whether emotional, practical, or moral, appear to buffer the effects of workload demands, indicating that commitment and development act as protective factors against stress.

The findings reveal significant positive relationships between workload demands, professional development opportunities, and organizational commitment. This indicates that as teachers become more engaged in professional growth and more committed to their institutions, their perceived workload also increases.

This relationship suggests that professional engagement and organizational attachment, while beneficial, may lead to expanded responsibilities. Teachers who actively participate in development activities and organizational functions may assume additional roles, contributing to higher workload demands.

These results imply that institutions should integrate professional development initiatives with strategies to strengthen organizational commitment. By aligning workload management with opportunities for growth and fostering loyalty through a supportive organizational culture, schools can reduce the negative impact of workload demands. This holistic approach ensures that teachers remain engaged, resilient, and effective despite the pressures of their responsibilities.

The findings align with Saikia et al. (2025), who emphasized that institutional support systems, such as knowledge repositories and governance structures, sustain professional development and keep workload demands manageable. Similarly, Melesse and Belay (2022) demonstrated that participation in professional development enhances job satisfaction and organizational loyalty, reinforcing the link between development, commitment, and workload management. Together, these studies affirm that professional growth and organizational support are essential in mitigating workload pressures and sustaining teacher effectiveness.

### Predictors of Teachers’ Workload Demands

The regression analysis shows that several predictor variables significantly influence teachers’ workload demands, with an overall model fit of  $R=.605$ ,  $R^2=.366$ ,  $F=34.37$ ,  $p=.000$ . Among the predictors, Normative Commitment ( $B=.261$ ,  $p=.000$ ) had the strongest effect, followed by Instructional Development ( $B=.177$ ,  $p=.001$ ), Organizational Development ( $B=.183$ ,  $p=.003$ ), Personal Development ( $B=.166$ ,  $p=.006$ ), and Affective Commitment ( $B=.158$ ,  $p=.003$ ).

Table 15. Regression Analysis Showing the Extent of Influence of Predictor Variables on the Teachers’ Workload Demands.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	.553	.263		2.101	.036
Normative Commitment	.227	.045	.261	5.053	.000
Affective Commitment	.154	.051	.158	3.009	.003
Organizational Development	.164	.055	.183	2.977	.003
Instructional Development	.187	.056	.177	3.352	.001
Personal Development	.156	.056	.166	2.782	.006

a. Dependent Variable: Workload Demands

$R= .605$        $R^2= .366$        $F=34.37$        $Sig= .000$

The findings suggest that teachers’ workload demands are shaped not only by institutional structures but also by their sense of moral obligation and professional growth opportunities. Normative commitment’s strong influence highlights that teachers who feel duty-bound to remain in their institutions perceive workload demands more

intensely. Meanwhile, professional development dimensions, particularly the instructional and organizational dimensions, also contribute, suggesting that as teachers engage in growth opportunities, they become more aware of the workload pressures associated with their expanded roles.

The regression analysis demonstrates that normative commitment, affective commitment, and selected professional development dimensions significantly predict workload demands ( $R^2 = 0.366$ ). Normative commitment emerged as the strongest predictor, indicating that teachers who feel a moral obligation to their institutions are more likely to assume additional responsibilities. This suggests that value-based commitment may lead to increased workload acceptance.

Professional development dimensions—particularly instructional and organizational development—also significantly contribute, implying that increased engagement in professional growth expands teachers' roles. These findings indicate that workload demands are not solely imposed but are partly shaped by teachers' own engagement, commitment, and professional involvement. While professional development enhances competence, it may also intensify workload if not supported by appropriate institutional structures.

The model yielded an R value of .605 and an  $R^2$  value of .366, indicating that 36.6% of the variance in workload demands is explained by the combined influence of professional development opportunities and organizational commitment variables. This suggests that the predictor variables included in the model have a meaningful contribution in explaining workload demands, while the remaining 63.4% may be attributed to other factors not included in the study.

The model can be expressed as:

$$Y=0.553+0.227(X1)+0.154(X2)+0.164(X3)+0.187(X4)+0.156(X5)$$

Where:

0.553 is constant

X1= Normative (Organizational Commitment)

X2= Affective (Organizational Commitment)

X3= Organizational Development (Professional Development Opportunities)

X4= Instructional Development (Professional Development Opportunities)

X5= Personal Development (Professional Development Opportunities)

The regression equation shows how each predictor variable contributes to teachers' workload demands when all variables are considered together. The constant value of 0.553 represents the baseline level of workload demands when all predictor variables are at zero. Each coefficient in the equation indicates the expected change in workload demands for every one-unit increase in the corresponding predictor variable, while holding the other variables constant.

Specifically, a one-unit increase in normative commitment results in a 0.227 increase in workload demands, indicating that teachers who have a stronger sense of obligation to their organization tend to experience higher workload demands. Similarly, a one-unit increase in affective commitment leads to a 0.154 increase in workload demands, suggesting that emotional attachment to the organization is associated with increased workload engagement. In terms of professional development variables, a one-unit increase in organizational development corresponds to a 0.164 increase, instructional development to a 0.187 increase, and personal development to a 0.156 increase in workload demands. This implies that greater involvement in these development areas is associated with increased workload demands.

The findings align with Ballenas et al. (2023), who emphasized that compliance with CPD is influenced by organizational learning culture and managerial support, reinforcing the link between development and workload perception. Similarly, Saikia et al. (2025) highlighted that institutional governance and support systems sustain professional development while helping teachers manage workload demands effectively. The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory explains that job resources, such as professional development, enhance employees' ability to manage job demands, thereby influencing workload experiences. Studies by Pan et al. (2023) and Evers et al. (2016) indicate that teachers engage in professional development as a mechanism to cope with increasing workload demands, supporting the predictive role of instructional, organizational, and personal development variables.

Similarly, research by Cayupe et al. (2023) and Fehintola et al. (2023) confirms that organizational commitment significantly influences how teachers respond to workload pressures, with commitment dimensions shaping their engagement and resilience. In particular, the emergence of normative commitment as the best predictor aligns with studies suggesting that moral obligation and sense of duty play a critical role in sustaining teachers' performance under demanding conditions. These studies affirm that workload pressures are intertwined with both professional growth and organizational commitment, underscoring the need for balanced institutional strategies.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

Teachers consistently demonstrated engagement in Professional Development Opportunities (PDOs) across instructional, scientific, personal, and organizational domains, with all dimensions rated as High Opportunity.

Teachers exhibited moderate levels of organizational commitment across affective, continuance, and normative dimensions.

The overall level of workload demands was interpreted as High, with teachers reporting high workload demand in time, quantitative, and qualitative expectations.

The study concludes that there is a significant correlation between workload demands and both professional development opportunities and organizational commitment. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho1) stating that there is no significant relationship between PDOs and organizational commitment is failed to be accepted. Similarly, the null hypothesis (Ho2) regarding workload demands and organizational commitment is also failed to be accepted, confirming that these variables are significantly related.

Finally, regression analysis revealed that normative commitment, affective commitment, and instructional, organizational, and personal professional development opportunities significantly predict workload demands. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho3) stating that there are no variables—singly or in combination—among PDOs and organizational commitment that significantly predict workload demands is rejected.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and the significance of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Teachers are encouraged to maximize available Professional Development Opportunities (PDOs) while adopting effective workload management strategies. Since PDOs were found to significantly influence workload perceptions, teachers should engage in continuous learning but also practice time management and collaborative approaches to balance professional growth with well-being. This will enhance their competence while reducing stress associated with high workload demands.

School administrators may design policies and programs that balance workload demands with meaningful professional development initiatives. Since organizational commitment was found to be moderate, institutions must strengthen supportive work environments by recognizing teachers' contributions, ensuring equitable task

distribution, and fostering collaboration. Doing so will not only improve teacher retention but also enhance institutional effectiveness.

Students benefit most when teachers are professionally supported and organizationally committed. Institutions may therefore ensure that PDOs and workload management strategies directly translate into improved classroom practices. By supporting teachers' growth and reducing unnecessary workload pressures, schools can improve learning outcomes and create a more positive educational experience for students.

This study may serve as a reference for further investigations into the interplay of professional development, workload demands, and organizational commitment. Future research could expand to public school settings or explore additional variables such as teacher motivation, leadership practices, and institutional culture. Such studies will deepen understanding of teacher retention and professional fulfillment across diverse educational contexts.

Since regression results confirmed that PDOs and organizational commitment significantly predict workload demands, policymakers and school leaders may integrate professional growth initiatives with workload management frameworks. This means aligning training programs with realistic expectations and providing institutional support systems that prevent burnout. By doing so, private schools in Bukidnon can strengthen teacher engagement, retention, and overall institutional success.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdrakhmanova, K., Kadirbayeva, R., Kudaibergenova, K., Zharmukhanbetov, S., & Nurmukhanbetova, N. (2025). Formation of STEM competencies of future teachers: Kazakhstani experience. *Open Education Studies*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2024-0058>
2. Abdullah, M. H. S., & Hassan, N. M. (2024). Negative Implications of Workload among Teachers: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v13-i3/22193>
3. Agcaoili, M. C., & Bascos-Ocampo, R. (2022). Teaching readiness, workload analysis and performance of teachers in Luna District. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2022/v28i230674>
4. Ahmad, A. (2018). The relationship among job characteristics organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 10(1), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jwam-09-2017-0027>
5. Ahmed, S. a. M., Zhang, W., Ma, H., & Feng, Z. (2023). Professional development for STEM educators: A bibliometric analysis of the recent progress. *Review of Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3392>
6. Alda, R. C., Boholano, H. B., & De Leon-Abao, E. (2024). Career progression of graduates in diploma for professional education. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 19(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i1.21831>
7. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
8. Alomran, A. M., Ahmed, T. S. A., & Kassem, A. M. (2024). Impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment: the moderating effect of national identity. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2309712>
9. Alves, P., Azevedo, J., & Gonçalves, C. (2019). Teachers' time management and workload: Implications for stress and performance. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 6(5), 45–59.
10. Ancho, I., & Bongco, R. (2019). Exploring filipino teachers' professional workload. *Journal of Research Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 9(2), 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol9.no2.2.2019>
11. Arukaroha, J., & Arubayi, D. O. (2022). WORK ETHICS CLIMATE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN NIGERIA: A survey of consumer goods companies. *Management and Human Resource Research Journal*, 11–9. <https://cirdjournals.com/index.php/mhrrj/article/view/880/806>

12. Avunduk, Y. (2021). The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 7(2), 146. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v7i2.18966>
13. Bading, W. C. (2023). Organizational Commitment of Teachers: Its effects on the performance of students in the high Schools of Sanchez Mira, Cagayan. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 2, 92–108.
14. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
15. Ballenas, G. J., Tidong, Y. P., Granaderos, R. D., & Tagadiad, J. V. (2023). Research culture and organizational learning on professional development of secondary teachers. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 11(9), 580–593. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-11-9-7>
16. Banal, C. L., & Cruz, R. a. O. (2022). Teachers’ resilience in facing workload adversities in times of pandemic: The case of the private school teachers in a developing country. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.20473/ijss.v14i1.35946>
17. Batugal, M. L. C., & Tindowen, D. J. C. (2019). Influence of organizational culture on teachers’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction: the case of Catholic higher education institutions in the Philippines. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(11), 2432–2443. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.071121>
18. Beach, P., Minuk, A., & Favret, E. (2022). Teachers’ Self-Directed Online Learning Strategies and Experiences: A Longitudinal study. *Online Learning*, 26(4). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v26i4.3441>
19. Belay, S., Melese, S., & Seifu, A. (2021). Advancing teachers’ human capital through effective leadership and institutional safety: Mediating effect of professional learning and teaching climate. Taylor and Francis Online. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1912488?needAccess=true>
20. Bellibaş, M. Ş., Gümüş, S., & Chen, J. (2023). The impact of distributed leadership on teacher commitment: The mediation role of teacher workload stress and teacher well-being. *British Educational Research Journal*, 50(2), 814–836. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3944>
21. Bhatt, S. P. (2021). Self-Directed Professional Development: EFL teachers’ understanding. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 3(4), 196–208. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v3i4.737>
22. Bibi, A., Khalid, M. A., & Hussain, A. (2019). Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment among special education teachers in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(5), 848–859. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-12-2017-0365>
23. Blanco, C. G. R., Buenvenida, L. P., Tan, C. S., Yazon, A. D., & Lapie, L. P. (2022). Organizational commitment, teachers’ empowerment, and transformational teaching of public elementary schools in Laguna, Philippines. *International Journal of Emerging Issues in Early Childhood Education*, 4(2), 12–28. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijeiece.v4i2.1122>
24. Burgin, X. D., & Daniel, M. C. (2025). Ecuador’s goals for equity and inclusivity: In-service teachers’ perspectives. *Policy Futures in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103251374376>
25. Cadenas, J. I. C. (2025). Human, social, cultural, and organizational capital as predictors of turnover intention among faculty in nursing education. Volume 1 Issue 8. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16788964>
26. Camral, A., & Sumayo, G. (2025). Continuing professional development engagement and pedagogical competence of public elementary school teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, 2(1), 77–104. <https://doi.org/10.70847/592788>
27. Cayupe, J. C., Bernedo-Moreira, D. H., Morales-García, W. C., Alcaraz, F. L., Peña, K. B. C., Saintila, J., & Flores-Paredes, A. (2023). Self-efficacy, organizational commitment, workload as predictors of life satisfaction in elementary school teachers: the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1066321>
28. Chen, C., & Fan, J. (2025). Predicting early childhood teachers’ job satisfaction by Pedagogical Leadership: a moderated mediation model of workload stress and professional collaboration. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-025-01960-5>
29. Clores, S. C. (2025). Human resource management and teachers performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 170(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001701420257751>
30. Collie, R. J., & Mansfield, C. F. (2022). Teacher and school stress profiles: A multilevel examination and associations with work-related outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 116, 103759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103759>

31. Constantino, R. W., & Antonio, R. P. (2025). MAPPING THE STEM EDUCATION RESEARCH IN THE PHILIPPINES. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 83(5), 626–644. <https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/25.83.626>
32. Costa, M. C., Domingos, A. M. D., Teodoro, V. D., & Vinhas, É. M. R. G. (2022). Teacher Professional Development in STEM Education: An Integrated Approach with Real-World Scenarios in Portugal. *Mathematics*, 10(21), 3944. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math10213944>
33. Coventry, T. H., Maslin-Prothero, S. E., & Smith, G. (2015). Organizational impact of nurse supply and workload on nurses continuing professional development opportunities: an integrative review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(12), 2715–2727. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12724>
34. David, C. C., Albert, J. R. G., & Vizmanos, J. F. V. (2019). Pressures on public school teachers and implications on quality. In Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidspn1901.pdf>
35. Deep, P. D., Ghosh, N., & Chen, Y. (2025). Faculty burnout in Higher Education: Effects on student engagement, learning outcomes, and Artificial Intelligence-Driven Institutional Responses. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 15(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jedp.v15n1p29>
36. Demirbolat, A. O., Ihtiyaroglu, N., & Köse, E. K. (2017). AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AFFECTIVE, NORMATIVE, AND CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT OF TEACHERS AND LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(7). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.805996>
37. Digamon, J. S., & Prado, N. I. (2024). Teachers' organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, engagement, and burnout in the next normal. In *Transactions on computer systems and networks* (pp. 83–97). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4931-7\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4931-7_9)
38. Dominado, N. L., & Valdez, L. G. (2021). Stress in the workplace, depression, and academic workloads of public school teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(5), 417–423. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.05.08>
39. Edward, C. J., & Roda, S. J. (2022). Association between Teachers' Selflessness and School Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Education Science Technology and Engineering (IJESTE)*, 5(2), 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.36079/lamintang.ijeste-0502.410>
40. Effrosyni, B. (2020). Intercultural Story-Based Framework in Young Language Learners' Classrooms: from alternative teaching to alternative assessment. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 17, 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2020.17.05>
41. Ekmekci, A., Aqazade, M., McGraw, R., Rushton, G., Gibson, D. J., Cerosaletti, C., Daley, M., & Kucuk, B. (2025). Using human, social, structural, and positive psychological capital to explore science and mathematics teacher retention. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00523-1>
42. Escal, R. J. B. (2024). Organizational Culture and Commitment among the Academic Staff of Teacher Education Institutions: The Case of Northwest Samar State University, Philippines. In *Innovations*. <https://www.journal-innovations.com>
43. Evers, A. T., Van Der Heijden, B. I. J. M., Kreijns, K., Evers, A. T., Van Der Heijden, B. I. J. M., & Kreijns, K. (2016). Organisational and task factors influencing teachers' professional development at work. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 40(1), 36–55. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-03-2015-0023>
44. Farisi, S., Muslih, N., Siswadi, Y., & Arif, M. (2024). Factor affecting work engagement, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 28(2), 293–317. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jm.v28i2.1817>
45. Fehintola, V. A., Onyemah, T. N., A, I. S., Raji, N. A., Sylvester, A. O., & Adewuyi, H. O. (2023). Enhancing teaching productivity among university staffers: the influence of organizational commitment and workload. *Journal of General Education and Humanities*, 3(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v3i1.190>
46. Fernandes, S., Araújo, A. M., Miguel, I., & Abelha, M. (2023). Teacher Professional development in Higher Education: The impact of pedagogical training perceived by teachers. *Education Sciences*, 13(3), 309. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13030309>
47. Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of teacher workload on attrition and instructional quality. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(44), 1–30.

48. Gökyer, N. (2018). Organizational commitment of high school teachers. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(3a), 115. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i3a.3165>
49. Guhao, E. S., Jr. (2019). ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS: A STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING ANALYSIS. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 7(1), 57–91. <https://doi.org/10.22452/mojem/vol7no1.4>
50. Guiraldo-Tutania, M., & Castro, J. (2025). Teachers' narratives on professional growth and career advancement. *International Journal of Open-access Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 4(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.63498/nxz2st260>
51. Gunawan, C. I., Maharani, N. D., & Irawanto, D. W. (2024). Modeling Affective Commitment and Job Satisfaction as A Mediating Role in Predicting Turnover Intention among Gen Z Employees. *JBTI Jurnal Bisnis Teori Dan Implementasi*, 15(2), 143–160. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jbti.v15i2.20881>
52. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Turunen, J. (2016). The future of teacher well-being: Coping with time pressure and demands. *Educational Psychology Review*.
53. Hameli, K., & Ordun, G. (2022). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. *European Journal of Management Studies*, 27(1), 75–97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejms-05-2021-0033>
54. Heffernan, A., Bright, D., Kim, M., Longmuir, F., & Magyar, B. (2022). 'I cannot sustain the workload and the emotional toll': Reasons behind Australian teachers' intentions to leave the profession. *Australian Journal of Education*, 66(2), 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00049441221086654>
55. Herrera, S. (2018). Scholar commentary. *Teaching Education*, 29(4), 424–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2018.1508434>
56. Ikyanyon, D. N., & Agber, I. A. (2020). Examining the Effect of Employee Commitment on Organizational Performance: Evidence from a Cement Manufacturing Company in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal ESJ*, 16(22). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p78>
57. Imakpokpomwan, M. I., & Odjugo, P. (2024). THE PLACE OF HUMAN CAPITAL FORMATION THEORY IN THE CONTINUOUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS. *Journal of Theoretical and Empirical Studies in Education*. <https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/jtese>
58. Importante, S. C. B., & Roberto, J. T. (2020). Workplace values and organizational commitment of basic education teachers in Catholic schools. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(2), 47–48. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v3i2.224>
59. Ishak, M., Oderinde, I., & Ahmad, S. (2025). The role of Metacognitive Strategies in Enhancing learning Outcomes and Educational Efficiency: A Systematic review of Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed-Method studies. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v15-i4/24964>
60. Jarosinski, J. M., Seldomridge, L., Reid, T. P., & Willey, J. (2021). Nurse faculty shortage. *Nurse Educator*, 47(3), 151–155. <https://doi.org/10.1097/nne.0000000000001139>
61. Jelongos, C. S., & Naanep, N. D. (2025). Extra workload, time pressure and teachers' stress levels. *International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2). <https://pantaojournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/38-Jelongos.pdf>
62. Jerrim, J., & Sims, S. (2020). Teacher workload and well-being. New international evidence from the OECD TALIS study. [https://johnjerrim.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/working\\_paper\\_workload\\_wellbeing\\_november\\_2020.pdf](https://johnjerrim.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/working_paper_workload_wellbeing_november_2020.pdf)
63. Jimenez, J. B., Montes, N. T., Velez, J. D., & Caballero, M. M. A. (2021). Organizational Communication in Relation to the Organizational Commitment among Local Government Employees, Panglao, Bohol. *University of Bohol Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(1), 30–56. <https://doi.org/10.15631/ubmrj.v9i1.132>
64. Johari, J., Tan, F. Y., & Zulkarnain, Z. I. T. (2018). Autonomy, workload, work-life balance and job performance among teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-10-2016-0226>
65. Jomuad, P., Leah, M., Cericos, E., Bacus, J., Vallejo, J., Dionio, B., Bazar, J., Cocolan, J., & Clarin, A. (2021). Teachers' workload in relation to burnout and work performance. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 8(2), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.15739/ijepr.21.007>

66. Kalelioglu, F., & Sentance, S. (2019). Teaching with physical computing in school: the case of the micro:bit. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(4), 2577–2603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-10080-8>
67. Karanfil, F., & Khatami, M. (2021). The Correlation between Teachers' Burnout and Workload : The Case of Iranian EFL Teachers. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 18(3), 1023–1031. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.3.22.1023>
68. Kasáčová, B., Babiaková, S., & Hanesová, D. (2019). PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND WORKLOAD OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS: INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON. *ICERI Proceedings*, 1, 1340–1349. <https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2019.0402>
69. Khalid, K. (2020). The impact of managerial support on the association between pay satisfaction, continuance and affective commitment, and employee task performance. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 215824402091459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914591>
70. Kim, J., & Loadman, W. (2019). Teacher workload and job satisfaction: Implications for retention. *International Journal of Education Policy*, 12(3), 215–229.
71. Klink, M. V. D., Kools, Q., Avissar, G., White, S., & Sakata, T. (2016). Professional development of teacher educators: what do they do? Findings from an explorative international study. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(2), 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1114506>
72. Kokubun, K. (2019). Organizational commitment, rewards and education in the Philippines. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 27(5), 1605–1630. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-02-2019-1667>
73. Lee, M., & Kim, B. (2023). Effect of employee experience on organizational commitment: Case of South Korea. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(7), 521. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13070521>
74. Lee, S., & Schallert, D. L. (2016). Becoming a teacher: Coordinating past, present, and future selves with perspectival understandings about teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.02.004>
75. Lie, D., Saraswati, K. D. H., & Lie, D. S. (2023). Work engagement influences affective commitment: psychological capital and perceived organisation support as moderators. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 38(2). <https://doi.org/10.22146/jieb.v38i2.6821>
76. Lindfors, T., Ahtainen, R., Heikonen, L., & Toom, A. (2024). Leading cooperative professional development in educational reform at school, local and regional levels. *Research Papers in Education*, 40(4), 587–612. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2024.2447026>
77. Liu, W.-S., Li, X.-W., & Zou, Y.-M. (2018). The Formation of Teachers' Intrinsic Motivation in Professional Development. *Integr Psychol Behav Sci*, 53(3), 30338438. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12124-018-9465-3>
78. Longmuir, F., & McKay, A. (2024). Teachers workload strain: considering the density as well as the quantity of teachers work. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 44(4), 561–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-024-00279-2>
79. Low, E. L., Goh, S., & Tan, J. S. Y. (2022). The Future of work in Education: Teachers' professional commitment in a changing world. *ScholarWorks at UMass Boston*, 34(1), 8. [https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol34/iss1/8?utm\\_source=scholarworks.umb.edu%2Fnejpp%2Fvol34%2Fiss1%2F8&utm\\_medium=PDF&utm\\_campaign=PDFCoverPages](https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol34/iss1/8?utm_source=scholarworks.umb.edu%2Fnejpp%2Fvol34%2Fiss1%2F8&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)
80. Ludwig-Beymer, P., Vottero, B., Coates, A., Blodgett, N., Rogers, J., & McGonigal-Kenney, M. (2021). Nursing faculty workload. *Nurse Educator*, 47(3), 174–179. <https://doi.org/10.1097/nne.0000000000001121>
81. Mabitad, B. D., & Gudelos, J. T. (2025). Understanding the Interplay of Stress, Workloads, and Teaching Performance: Evidence from Senior High School Teachers in the Philippines. *Business, Education, Social Sciences, and Technology*, 1–1, 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.69478/BEST2025v1n1a018>
82. Magtalas, S. A. (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>
83. Mallillin, L. L. D., & Laurel, R. D. (2022). PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM THEORY FOR QUALITY EDUCATION. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 9(8). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v9i8.4407>

84. Manegdeg, J. F. T., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Collaboration opportunities and workload on professional development access of Public-School teachers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, IX(XII), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.51584/ijrias.2024.912008>
85. Mangahas, T. L. S. (2023). Human capital development in university teaching environment: the role of workplace and innovation culture. *International Journal of Human Capital in Urban Management*, 8(4), 469–484. <https://doi.org/10.22034/IJHCUM.2023.04.03>
86. Manuel, J., Carter, D., & Dutton, J. (2018). “As much as I love being in the classroom . . .”: Understanding secondary English teachers’ workload. *Open Publications of UTS Scholars (University of Technology Sydney)*, 53(3), 5–22. <http://hdl.handle.net/10453/131563>
87. Mavrogordato, M., Youngs, P., Donaldson, M. L., Kang, H., & Dougherty, S. M. (2023). Motivating Leadership Change and Improvement: How principal Evaluation addresses intrinsic and extrinsic sources of motivation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 59(5), 965–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x231188706>
88. Melesse, T., & Belay, S. (2022). Uplifting teachers’ professional capital through promoting engagement in professional learning: Mediating effect of teacher job satisfaction. *Cogent Education*, 2057102. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2057102?needAccess=true>
89. Merino, C., Pacheco, G., Arenas-Martija, A., Becerra, R., & Solis-Pinilla, J. (2025). Continuing professional development in teachers: insights for designing a formative trajectory in scientific education. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1537502>
90. Mitra, M. J. L. (2025). Professional Learning Networks: Exploring Filipino Teachers’ Experiences and Pathways Toward Inclusive and Sustainable Professional Development in Rural Schools [Journal-article]. *Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal*, 1(5). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15500068>
91. Molina, M. C., & Escarlos, G. S. (2024). WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT ON ATTRITION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS. *International Journal of All Research Writings*, Vol. 6(Issue. 6), 298–299. <https://www.ijarw.com>
92. Moyer, S. M., & Moyer, S. M. (2022). Work-Life Balance of Nursing Faculty: A scoping review. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 43(4), 211–216. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.nep.0000000000000952>
93. Nababan, M. D. L., Hernandya, V. N., Hamidah, G. S., Syukriati, H., Fauziah, A. N., & Oktafien, S. (2022). EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND EMPLOYEE WORKLOAD ON TURNOVER INTENTION AT PT DHANAR MAS CONCERN. In *CENTRAL ASIA AND THE CAUCASUS English Edition (Vol. 23, Issue 1)*. <https://www.ca-c.org/index.php/cac/article/view/73>
94. Ngakantsi, I. S. (2022). Examining the Relationship Between the Psychological Contract, Organisational Commitment and Employee Retention in the Water Control Sector of South Africa [Thesis, University of South Africa]. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/9eb1668a1cbd82862470839ea686ff7e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y>
95. Ngao, A. I., Sang, G., & Kihwele, J. E. (2022). Understanding Teacher Educators’ Perceptions and Practices about ICT Integration in Teacher Education Program. *Education Sciences*, 12(8), 549. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12080549>
96. Nguyen, H. C. (2018). An investigation of professional development among educational policy-makers, institutional leaders and teachers. *Management in Education*, 33(1), 32–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020618781678>
97. Ntumi, S., Amos, P. M., Antwi, T., Nimo, D. G., Ofori, D. M., & Sarfo, P. O. (2025). Linking burnout emotional exhaustion and assessment related stress to mental health outcomes among early career teachers: counselling support as a dual mediating and moderating factor. *Research Square (Research Square)*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7003152/v1>
98. Nwoko, J. C., Emeto, T. I., Malau-Aduli, A. E. O., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2023). A systematic review of the factors that influence teachers’ occupational wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(12), 6070. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070>
99. Nyoto, N., Sudarno, N., Priyono, N., Surikin, N., & Renaldo, N. (2023). Emotional intelligence, workload, and cyberloafing on organizational commitment and performance of teachers at the Pelalawan High School level. *Journal of Applied Business and Technology*, 4(2), 134–143. <https://doi.org/10.35145/jabt.v4i2.129>

100. Ömür, G. A. (2025). The Relationship Between Motivation and Organizational Commitment: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Researches on Multidisciplinary Approaches*, 49–62. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/5198849>
101. Ong, J. F. B., Tan, J. M. T., Villareal, R. F. C., & Chiu, J. L. (2019). Impact of quality work life and prosocial motivation on the organizational commitment and turnover intent of public health practitioners. In *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*. GMP Press and Printing. [https://buscompress.com/uploads/3/4/9/8/34980536/riber\\_8-s4\\_01\\_k19-140\\_24-43.pdf](https://buscompress.com/uploads/3/4/9/8/34980536/riber_8-s4_01_k19-140_24-43.pdf)
102. Pamolarco, E. S., Jr. (2025). The role of Filipino-American educational organizations in the professional development of Filipino-American teachers. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 12, 137–192. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v12i1.190>
103. Pan, H. W., Chung, C., & Lin, Y. (2023). Exploring the Predictors of Teacher Well-Being: An analysis of teacher training preparedness, autonomy, and workload. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5804. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075804>
104. Pathak, A., Kadyan, S., Kothari, H., Singh, S., & Srinivas, V. (2025). THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, WELL-BEING, AND OCCUPATIONAL STRESS ON TEACHER MENTAL HEALTH IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, Vol.32(No.S1). <https://tpmap.org/submission/index.php/tpm/article/view/135/21>
105. Payod, E. P., Canque, M. S., & Derasin, L. M. C. (2021). Organizational commitment of a Non-Teaching personnel in a state university in the Philippines. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 12(14), 583–589. <https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmat/article/view/10322>
106. Peneyra, R. V. (2025). Professional Development Needs and Core Behavioral Competence of Secondary Teachers in Relation to their Instructional Performance and Students' Academic Achievement: Input for Teacher Training and Development. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)*, 08–08(06), 01–15. <http://www.ijlrhss.com/paper/volume-8-issue-6/1-HSS-3099.pdf>
107. Pergamino, G. M., & Yuayan, A. P. (2021). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among teachers of the Bohol Association of Catholic Schools, Diocese of Tagbilaran. *University of Bohol Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.15631/ubmrj.v9i1.131>
108. Radkowsch, A., Sommerhoff, D., Nickl, M., Codreanu, E., Ufer, S., & Seidel, T. (2023). Exploring the diagnostic process of pre-service teachers using a simulation – A latent profile approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 130, 104172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104172>
109. Ramada, M. G. (2020). Human resources management practices, job satisfaction and faculty performance. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 2(2), 24–35. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/351784-human-resources-management-practices-job-7285c52a.pdf>
110. Rehman, N., Huang, X., Mahmood, A., Zafeer, H. M. I., & Mohammad, N. K. (2025). Emerging trends and effective strategies in STEM teacher professional development: A systematic review. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04272-y>
111. Rivera, J. P., Sinsay-Villanueva, L. M., Tanyag, I. H., Berroya, J., Garcia, G. D., & Lim, V. (2025). Revitalizing the Philippine education system: facilitating access and participation to In-Service Training (INSET) and teacher Professional Development (TPD). <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.14>
112. Roncesvalles, M. C. T., & Gaerlan, A. A. (2021). The role of authentic leadership and teachers' organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(2), 92–121. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1310299.pdf>
113. Rose, P. V. (2022). Women in STEM: An examination of career commitment as a moderator to organizational commitment. *FireScholars*. [https://firescholars.seu.edu/org-lead/6?utm\\_source=firescholars.seu.edu%2Forg-lead%2F6&utm\\_medium=PDF&utm\\_campaign=PDFCoverPages](https://firescholars.seu.edu/org-lead/6?utm_source=firescholars.seu.edu%2Forg-lead%2F6&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)
114. Rothacker-Peyton, S., Wilson-Anderson, K., & Mayer, K. (2022). Nursing faculty professional quality of life and resilience in a changing educational environment. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 61(6), 330–333. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20220404-12>

115. Rubio-Valdehita, S., López-Núñez, M., López-Higes, R., & Díaz-Ramiro, E. (2017). Development of the CarMen-Q Questionnaire for mental workload assessment. *Psicothema*, 4(29), 570–576. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2017.151>
116. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860.
117. Sabuero, J. B. (2023). The mediating effect of organizational culture on the relationship between organizational commitment and work-life balance among business management faculty. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(11), 3989–3998. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.11.19>
118. Saikia, D., Chhibber, P., & Gan, C. (2025). Understanding the role of structural capital as facilitator in professional learning networks and organizational learning of university. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*. <https://www.emerald.com/jpcc/article-abstract/doi/10.1108/JPC-09-2024-0166/1298967/Understanding-the-role-of-structural-capital-as>
119. Santiago, C. T. (2019). Teacher's Affective Attitude and its Effect on their Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 48(3), 78–91. <https://gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/download/10270/5432>
120. Sellen, P. (2016). Teacher workload and professional development in England's secondary schools: insights from TALIS: 10 October 2016. Digital Education Resource Archive (University College London). [http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/27930/1/TeacherWorkload\\_EPI.pdf](http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/27930/1/TeacherWorkload_EPI.pdf)
121. Shaik-Abdullah, S., Shanmugam, S. K. S., & Chinnappan, M. (2018). Action Research as continuous professional development in Southeast Asia. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.699>
122. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Teacher stress and burnout: Relations to time pressure and workload. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 102–111.
123. Smet, M. (2021). Professional Development and Teacher Job Satisfaction: Evidence from a Multilevel Model. *Mathematics*, 10(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math10010051>
124. Solania, N., Coñado, E., Paguta, M. J., Ventura, R., & Arnado, A. (2023). The influence of workload and work motivation on the performance of teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(4), 1270–1277. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.04.22>
125. Sun, L., Chen, D., & Xu, J. (2023). Changes in workload of Chinese university undergraduate teaching from the perspective of education quality management: A case study of a teaching-research university. *International Journal of Metrology and Quality Engineering*, 14, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1051/ijmqe/2023012>
126. Taga, J. R. A. (2025). Faculty Readiness and Professional Development for Distance Education in Philippine Higher Education Institutions: A Scoping Review [Article]. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR)*, 9(9), 70–74. <https://www.ijeais.org/ijapr>
127. Taquiso, E. L. (2025). Organizational commitment of employees of a private higher institution. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 614–623. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2025.v05i01.047>
128. Tarraya, H. O. (2023). Teachers' workload Policy: Its impact on Philippine public school teachers. *Puissant*, Vol. 5. <https://puissant.stepacademic.net>
129. Tiangco, A. N. G. (2018). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Private School Teachers in Nasugbu, Batangas: Basis for Improving Teachers' Retention. *Abstract Proceedings International Scholars Conference*, 6(1), 225. <https://doi.org/10.35974/isc.v6i1.1365>
130. Tjahjono, H. K., Rahayu, M. K. P., & Putra, A. D. (2020). THE MEDIATING ROLE OF AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT ON THE EFFECT OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICE ON JOB PERFORMANCE OF CIVIL SERVANT. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.22146/jlo.55371>
131. Tong, W., & Razniak, A. (2016). Building professional capital within a 21st century learning framework. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*. <https://www.emerald.com/jpcc/article-abstract/2/1/36/238744/Building-professional-capital-within-a-21st?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
132. Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: the importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247>

133. Tuerah, P. R. (2025). Teacher Professional Development in Implementing Inclusive Education Practices. *PT. NALURI EDUKASI PRESS*, 2(3), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.64924/cs3h9b14>
134. Tullao, T. Jr. S., Cabuay, C. J., & Hofilena, D. (2015). Establishing the Linkages of Human Resource Development with Inclusive Growth. In Philippine Institute for Development Studies, PIDS Discussion Paper Series (No. 2015–13). Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS). <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/127020/1/pidsdps1513.pdf>
135. Ulla, M. B. (2018). Benefits and challenges of doing research: Experiences from Philippine public school teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(3), 797–810. <https://www.iier.org.au/iier28/ulla.pdf>
136. Van Droogenbroeck, F., Spruyt, B., & Vanroelen, C. (2016). Burnout among teachers: The role of workload and job resources. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 196–206.
137. Vangrieken, K., Meredith, C., Packer, T., & Kyndt, E. (2017). Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 19, 17–40.
138. Viterbo, L. D., & Dayaganon, A. J. B. (2025). THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS OF ESL TEACHERS IN THE PHILIPPINES: AN EXPLANATORY SEQUENT. . . In University of the Immaculate Conception, Graduate School Department, University of the Immaculate Conception. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17453981>
139. Wang, C., Norlizah, C. H., Muhamad, M., & Zhang, S. (2025). Empowering STEM educators in cross-cultural higher education contexts: professional development strategies for sustainable workforce readiness. *STEM Education*, 5(5), 954–973. <https://doi.org/10.3934/steme.2025042>
140. Yang, D., Zargar, E., Adams, A. M., Day, S. L., & Connor, C. M. (2020). Using interactive E-Book user log variables to track reading processes and predict digital learning outcomes. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 46(4), 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508420941935>
141. Yazon, A. D., & Ang-Manaig, K. (2019). Emotional Intelligence and Occupational Stress among Filipino Teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(11), 2303–2313. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.071108>
142. Yenen, E. T., & Yöntem, M. K. (2020). Teachers' Professional Development Needs: A Q Method analysis. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, 11(2), 159–176. <https://doi.org/10.2478/dcse-2020-0024>
143. Yongtao, G. (2025). Impact of workload on the performance of junior high school teachers under China's "Double Reduction" policy. *SAGE Open*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251345577>
144. Yoon, S., Yom, J. K., Yang, Z., & Liu, L. (2017). The Effects of Teachers' Social and Human Capital on Urban Science Reform Initiatives: Considerations for Professional Development. *Sage Journals Home*, Volume 119(Issue 4). <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/016146811711900407>
145. Yumang, A. O. (2025). Competence of Out-Of-Field Science Teachers: Basis for a professional development program. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES*, V(7). <https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/7-IJAMS-JULY-2025-1452-1469.pdf>
146. Zanabazar, A., & Jigjiddorj, S. (2022). Relationships between mental workload, job burnout, and organizational commitment. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 132, 01003. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202213201003>
147. Zerrad, H., & Schechter, C. (2025). Human capital development: principals' challenges in developing school staff. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*. <https://www.emerald.com/jpcc/article-abstract/doi/10.1108/JPC-09-2024-0159/1253952/Human-capital-development-principals-challenges-in?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
148. Zhao, S., Wang, T., Luo, S., Mi, Y., Wang, Y., Ma, H., & Wei, X. (2025). The impact of organizational commitment on job performance in primary healthcare: a motivation internalization perspective. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1685420>