

# Work Engagement and Organizational Behavior on Occupational Burnout of Teachers

Kenethnol M. Figueroa<sup>1</sup>, Aprell L. Abellana<sup>2</sup>, Raul C. Orongan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty, Valencia National High School, Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

<sup>2,3</sup>Faculty, Central Mindanao University, Musuan Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500194>

Received: 02 May 2026; Accepted: 08 May 2026; Published: 26 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study determined the relationship of the work engagement, organizational behavior, and occupational burnout of 250 public secondary school teachers in the Division of Valencia, Bukidnon, Philippines using a descriptive-correlational research design. Specifically, the study aimed to describe the levels of work engagement (vigor, dedication and absorption), organizational behavior (autocratic, custodial, supportive and collegial), and occupational burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal achievement) of teachers, examine the relationship of variables and determine the significant predictors of occupational burnout. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson's product-moment correlation and stepwise regression analysis.

The study showed that teachers have high level of work engagement and organizational behavior while their occupational burnout was found to be at a moderate level. The results indicated a significant positive association between work engagement (especially vigor and absorption) and occupational burnout, confirming a paradoxical "engaged-but-at-risk" profile of high-performing educators. Also, the results of regression analysis showed that vigor and custodial organizational behavior were the main predictors of occupational burnout and explained 10.5% of its variance. These results suggest that although motivation acts as a protective stabilizer, a high level of engagement without institutional support may inadvertently lead to burnout.

**Keywords:** Vigor, custodial organizational behavior, work engagement, occupational burnout, regression

## INTRODUCTION

The strongest and most direct influence on the performance of students is the daily teaching, motivation, and classroom management by the teachers (Kraft et al., 2017; TNTP, 2024). The low performance of the Philippines in various national and international tests, including the National Achievement Test (NAT) and PISA, has put the country's public school teachers in a tight spot to improve their performance and, in turn, improve the performance of their students (OECD, 2018; DepEd, 2022). Teachers were informed to try new things, including teaching methods and classes, to improve the performance of the students in tests. However, they are sometimes unfairly blamed for problems with the system, like not having enough facilities or a good enough curriculum (David et al., 2024). But how can teachers do their main job of teaching when they have to deal with a lot of paperwork, heavy workloads, and not enough resources? These things can make teachers burned out and unable to connect with students in a meaningful way (Ladres et al., 2025; Romero, 2021; EDCOM 2, 2024). Teachers are less motivated, less effective in the classroom, less engaged with their students, more likely to miss school, and, in the end, their lessons are not as good. (Magtalas, 2024a; Tarrayo, 2023).

Occupational burnout has been defined as "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment" (Maslach et al., 2016; Maslach et al., 2020). Globally, the prevalence of burnout

among teachers is found to be ranging from 20% to 50%. The results of the meta-analytic studies revealed the established relationship between the chronic job demands of teachers, such as workload, behavioral problems of students, and lack of autonomy, and emotional exhaustion (from 0.35 to 0.45) and depersonalization (Upadyaya et al., 2019). In the Philippines, recent research revealed moderate to high levels of burnout among public school teachers, primarily because of the presence of stressors like large class sizes, non-teaching administrative tasks like monthly accomplishment reports, and data gathering, which resulted in high turnover intentions and early retirement among teachers (Ladres et al., 2025; Francisco et al., 2024). Challenges faced by local regions add to exhaustion levels by 25 to 30 percent because of the scarcity of resources, geographical remoteness, and the administrative burden placed on teachers by the Department of Education (Calora, 2020).

Work engagement is a positive and fulfilling mental state at work that includes vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2024). On the other hand, occupational burnout is characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced sense of personal accomplishment, and work engagement protects against burnout by strengthening resilience and the use of personal job resources among teachers (Mérida-López et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022). There are two groups of Finnish teachers that show this pattern: a "high engagement" group (30%) that is doing well because they have a lot of control and aren't too tired, and a "engaged-burnout" group (70%) that is tired because they are overworked but still has a lot of energy. Research indicates that experienced educators display enhanced vitality and reduced burnout, highlighting the importance of tenure (Kim et al., 2017). In the Philippines, public elementary school teachers in Bohol are confronting challenges such as inadequate staffing and substantial burnout, predominantly attributed to emotional exhaustion, which is significantly linked to ineffective work engagement-based leadership ( $p < 0.001$  across vigor, dedication, and absorption subscales). When resources are limited and recovery support is insufficient, heightened dedication intensifies fatigue (Tugrul & Celik, 2021). Being very involved protects against burnout by encouraging good mental health and proactive behaviors, but being too involved without enough resources can actually make you more tired.

Organizational behavior is about how individuals act and interact within the organization. In the education setting it is about how teachers, administrators and staff interact within the school system to shape attitude and performance. Internationally, supportive and collegial organizational behavior buffers burnout by enhancing autonomy and resources, as evidenced by Mäkelä et al.'s (2019) Finnish study linking collegial profiles to reduced exhaustion and a 2022 U.S. analysis showing collegial behaviors explaining 28% of variance in lower burnout via personal accomplishment (Kim et al., 2022). In the Philippine context, prevalent autocratic and custodial organizational behavior amid resource shortages heightens burnout, yet collegial models offer protection: Calora (2020) found collegial organizational behavior as the strongest performance predictor among 70 junior high teachers, implying burnout reduction through collaboration, while Tugrul and Celik (2021) reported autocratic styles correlating with depersonalization and a 2023 study confirmed supportive organizational behavior's negative prediction of exhaustion. Across contexts, supportive and collegial organizational behavior consistently emerges as a protective factor against burnout by fostering psychological resources and relational buffers, while autocratic styles amplify exhaustion through constrained autonomy. These dynamic underscores organizational behavior's critical role in predicting and preventing teacher burnout, particularly in resource-limited settings like Philippine public schools.

Studies conducted globally and within the Philippines indicate a correlation between work engagement, organizational behaviors, and burnout outcomes. However, there is a lack of comprehensive studies in the Philippines examining these factors collectively, particularly among public school teachers, utilizing specific dimensions. (Romero, 2021). Contemporary literature often examines these factors in isolation—such as the influence of workload or specific leadership styles—overlooking their interactions and predictive effects on burnout, especially in under-resourced public schools facing the challenges of DepEd's MATATAG curriculum (Ladres et al., 2025). This study addressed the gap by quantifying levels of work engagement and particular organizational behaviors, examining their correlations and impacts on various dimensions of burnout, and offering evidence-based recommendations for targeted interventions such as leadership training and workload redistribution to enhance student outcomes and retain teachers.

## Objective of the Study

This study examined the relationship between work engagement, work behavior and occupational burnout of teachers. Specifically, the objectives of the study are as follows:

1. Describe the level of work engagement of public school teachers in terms of:
  - a. Vigor;
  - b. Dedication; and
  - c. Absorption.
2. Ascertain the level of organizational behavior of public school teachers in terms of:
  - a. Autocratic;
  - b. Custodial;
  - c. Supportive; and
  - d. Collegial.
3. Assess the level of occupational burnout of public school teachers in terms of:
  - a. Emotional Exhaustion;
  - b. Depersonalization; and
  - c. Personal Achievement.
4. Determine the relationship of occupational burnout of teachers and:
  - a. Work Engagement; and
  - b. Work Behavior.
5. Identify which variables predict the occupational burnout of public school teachers.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Respondents

The respondents of the study were 250 public secondary school teachers of selected schools in the Department of Education, Division of Valencia City. The researchers utilized non-probability sampling technique through purposive sampling in selecting the respondents.

### Research Design

The study employed a quantitative methodology via a descriptive-correlational research design to systematically analyze the relationship between work engagement, organizational behavior, and occupational burnout. This design is descriptive because it shows how public school teachers are doing. More specifically, it measures how engaged people are at work by looking at their vigor, dedication, and absorption. It also to find out what kinds of organizational behavior are most common in schools, which can range from autocratic to collegial. The descriptive section enables a standardized comparison of the teachers' emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and sense of personal achievement.

The study is fundamentally correlational, focusing on the statistical relationships between the designated independent and dependent variables. By analyzing these correlations, the researcher determined the association between fluctuations in work engagement and the perceived organizational climate with the incidence of burnout. The design concluded with a predictive analysis employing inferential statistics to identify the key variables that can forecast occupational burnout among public school teachers. This multi-layered approach made sure that the study finds out not only "what" is going on in the educational workplace, but also "why" some conditions make teacher burn out at work.

### Instrument

The first part is the work engagement questionnaire, adapted from Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) as used in the study of Briones et.al, 2023 in the study e-work self-efficacy, digital competence and work engagement of teachers in public secondary schools from two provinces in the Philippines. It has three sub-variables: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

The second part is the organizational behavior questionnaire which was adapted from Keith Davis’s Models of Organizational Behavior as used in the study of Calora (2020), organizational behavior and its effect on the performance of public junior high school teachers. It has four sub-variables: autocratic, custodial, supportive, and collegial.

The third part is the occupational burnout questionnaire, adopted from Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) created by Maslach and Jackson (1981) as used by Pabatang, et.al (2022) in the study Teachers’ burnout level and coping strategies in the time of pandemic: basis for proposal program to manage teacher’s burnout. The occupational burnout scale consists of 3 components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal achievement.

### Statistical Analysis

The study used descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage count, as well as mean and standard deviation to describe the data. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient analysis was utilized to ascertain the relationship between the independent and dependent variables of the study. Step-wise regression analysis was utilized to ascertain which among the independent variables strongly influences the dependent variables of the study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Work Engagement of Teacher

Table 1 summarizes the level of work engagement of teachers. The result yields an overall mean of 4.13 with a descriptive rating of “Usually” and with the qualitative interpretation of “High Work Engagement”. All of the indicators were rated high, which means the level of work engagement among teachers is high. The indicator, “Dedication.” got the highest mean of 4.34, this is followed by “Vigor” with a mean of 4.07. On the other hand, “Absorption” got the lowest mean of 3.98.

**Table 1. Level of work engagement of teachers**

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Dedication	4.34	Usually	High
Vigor	4.07	Usually	High
Absorption	3.98	Usually	High
Overall mean	4.13	Usually	High

According to the data obtained, it can be concluded that the work engagement of teachers is high, with all indicators rated high, indicating that teachers generally show a strong commitment, energy and involvement in their work. Interestingly, Dedication had the highest mean, indicating that teachers probably experience purpose and meaning in teaching, which could be a protective factor against occupational burnout through reduction of emotional exhaustion. Moreover, Vigor is also high, which reflects teachers’ resilience and motivation to cope with job demands, thus reducing the risk of burnout-related disengagement. Absorption had the lowest mean but still falls under the High interpretation. This suggests that although teachers are engaged, they may experience less deep immersion at times. This may mean that although teachers are generally committed, some work-related conditions (heavy workload, time pressure, administrative tasks, or classroom challenges) may still interrupt their full concentration and the ability to “lose themselves” in teaching tasks. Therefore, schools and administrators should strengthen supportive practices that help sustain teachers’ day-to-day focus, such as providing reasonable workload planning, reducing non-instructional burdens, offering coaching or mentoring to

improve instructional efficiency, and ensuring accessible support systems for stress management, so that teachers’ engagement remains stable and occupational burnout is further minimized over time.

Research shows the high work engagement levels of teachers. High dedication is a protective element against job burnout, while low absorption is observed due to workload interruptions. The research findings in this context are aligned with the recommended practices of proper workload management, minimized non-teaching responsibilities, coaching for teaching efficiency, and stress management support systems. This conforms to Salmela-Aro et al. (2019), who identified dominant high-engagement profiles among Finnish teachers marked by robust dedication and vigor buffering emotional exhaustion, though absorption was moderated by job demands; similarly, Maquidato and Bayani (2024) reported high work engagement among Philippine public school teachers, driven by dedication yet limited by administrative overload, while Wang et al. (2025) found elevated vigor and dedication mitigating burnout in Chinese primary teachers amid heavy workloads, advocating workload planning and mentoring; Hascher and Beltman (2017) confirmed internationally that high dedication fosters resilience against disengagement, with absorption interruptions necessitating stress supports, and Iancu et al. (2018) showed Romanian schools’ workload reductions and mentoring boosting absorption by 22% and cutting exhaustion, alongside Maquidato and Bayani (2024) endorsing DepEd time management training and Wang et al. (2025) verifying school stress supports lowering burnout by 18%.

### Organizational Behavior of Teachers

Table 2 presents the summary of the level of organizational behavior of teachers’ workplace. The result yields an overall mean of 3.64 with a descriptive rating of “Usually” and with the qualitative interpretation of “High” which indicate that organizational behavior in school is high. The indicator “Collegial” got the highest mean of 3.98, this is followed by indicator “Supportive” with a mean of 3.84, both fall under “Usually” rating and interpreted as “High. On the other hand, the indicator “Autocratic” got lowest mean of 3.33 and the indicator, “Custodial” got the second lowest mean of 3.42 with descriptive rating “sometimes” and qualitative interpretation “Moderate”.

**Table 2. Organizational Behavior of Teachers**

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Collegial	3.98	Usually	High
Supportive	3.84	Usually	High
Custodial	3.42	Sometimes	Moderate
Autocratic	3.33	Sometimes	Moderate
OVERALL MEAN	3.64	Usually	High

It can be inferred from the above that the workplace organizational behavior of the teachers is generally high. Thus, the school environment is characterized by workplace conditions that can mainly strengthen the teachers’ occupational well-being and reduce the risk of burnout especially because collegiality is the strongest feature and supportiveness is also consistently present. This means that teachers are likely to experience teamwork, shared responsibility and practical guidance from leaders which can help them cope with work demands and maintain emotional stamina. However, the lower dimensions especially autocratic behavior and custodial behavior suggest that although the school is not highly autocratic, aspects of security-related support and protective conditions are not experienced as consistently as other supportive factors. This may gradually affect teachers’ sense of stability, motivation and engagement during stressful periods. Hence, to foster teachers’ occupational behavior and mitigate burnout, schools should sustain and augment collegial and supportive practices, and improve custodial factors such as consistent protection of teachers’ welfare, fairness of job security policies, and clarity of management commitment to employee well-being, which may enhance resilience, facilitate sustained performance, and buffer burnout more effectively over time.

This is consistent with the research of Oberlechner and Polzl-Viol (2022), who found in higher education contexts that collegiality is the strongest predictor of lower burnout, as it directly promotes teamwork and self-discipline that counter isolation and keep emotional stamina during peak demands; however, their analysis also shows that when custodial factors such as steady job security and welfare protections lag, teachers experience

gradual motivational erosion and stability concerns, especially under prolonged stress testing baseline collegial buffers. More consistent with Collie et al. (2020), who found their research on teacher autonomy and support networks found that effective demand coping was associated with supportive climates and leader support, but inconsistent security-related practices increased the risk of cynicism by 22% when teachers felt there was a lack of welfare commitments, and the importance of adding transparency to collegiality to sustain engagement over time. Finally, direct empirical validation is presented by Wang (2024), demonstrating that the integration of organizational support (e.g. clear job security protocols and welfare-oriented management) with collegial practices results in a 25% decrease in emotional exhaustion (mediated by improved work engagement), while fairness in protective measures boosts performance resilience by clarifying commitment to well-being and preventing disengagement under workload pressures.

### Occupational Burnout of Teachers

Table 3 presents the level of occupational burnout among teachers. The result yields an overall mean of 3.08 with a descriptive rating of “Seldom” and with the qualitative interpretation of “Moderate” which indicate that teacher’s occupational burnout in school is moderate. The indicator “Personal Achievement” got the highest mean of 4.07 with descriptive rating of “Usually” and with qualitative interpretation “High”. This is followed by indicator “Emotional exhaustion” with a mean of 2.96 with descriptive rating of “Sometimes” and with qualitative interpretation “Moderate”. On the other hand, the indicator “Depersonalization” got lowest mean of 2.20 with descriptive rating of “Seldom” and with qualitative interpretation of “Low”.

**Table 3. Level of Teachers’ Occupational Burnout**

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Personal Achievement	4.07	Usually	High
Emotional Exhaustion	2.96	Sometimes	Moderate
Depersonalization	2.20	Seldom	Low
Overall mean	3.08	Sometimes	Moderate

Table III presents the level of occupational burnout among teachers. The result yields an overall mean of 3.08 with a descriptive rating of “Seldom” and with the qualitative interpretation of “Moderate” which indicate that teacher’s occupational burnout in school is moderate. The indicator “Personal Achievement” got the highest mean of 4.07 with descriptive rating of “Usually” and with qualitative interpretation “High”. This is followed by indicator “Emotional exhaustion” with a mean of 2.96 with descriptive rating of “Sometimes” and with qualitative interpretation “Moderate”. On the other hand, the indicator “Depersonalization” got lowest mean of 2.20 with descriptive rating of “Seldom” and with qualitative interpretation of “Low”.

The implication of the provided data suggests that occupational burnout of teachers in school is moderate. This means that burnout is present at a level that can affect teachers’ well-being and teaching efficacy but is not yet widespread across all dimensions of burnout. The greatest contributor is Personal Achievement which implies that teachers generally still see meaning, effectiveness, and positive impact in their work an important protective factor against the full development of burnout. Meanwhile, Emotional Exhaustion continues to be at moderate levels, showing that teachers are feeling work-related fatigue and emotional depletion that may slowly decrease motivation, patience, and classroom energy if stressors continue. Finally, Depersonalization is low, suggesting that teachers are relatively less likely to develop cynical or detached attitudes towards students, but the moderate emotional exhaustion indicates that this dimension might deteriorate over time without support. Therefore, school leaders and policymakers should focus on early burnout prevention by alleviating the sources of emotional exhaustion such as workload, administrative demands, class-size/behavioral challenges and emotional labor while maintaining the elements that help safeguard teachers’ sense of achievement such as recognition, professional development, mentoring, and supportive school culture.

This is aligned with Balois et al. (2025) who found moderate overall burnout for Philippine elementary teachers, where high personal accomplishment signaled preserved meaning and efficacy as a major protective factor against progression, along with moderate emotional exhaustion from workload and administrative demands, and low depersonalization signaling sustained student concern—mirroring the present study’s multidimensional

profile where burnout impacts well-being without catastrophe, but threatens classroom energy if stressors continue (Balois et al., 2025). Such patterns are consistent with Brown and Biddle (2023), where high compassion satisfaction in accomplishment mitigated burnout 4 times more than risks, supporting recognition and mentoring around protecting teacher impact despite moderate fatigue (Brown & Biddle, 2023). In a similar vein, McLean et al. (2022) reported low cynicism and moderate exhaustion, suggesting that workload/class size reduction and a supportive culture are needed to prevent deterioration, which aligns with the current policy emphasis on early interventions such as professional development and the reduction of emotional labour (McLean et al., 2022).

**Correlation of Work Engagement and Organizational Behavior to the Occupational Burnout of Teachers**

Table 4 presents the correlation analysis of the relationship between work engagement and organizational behavior on teachers' occupational burnout. It reflects the correlation coefficient *r* of these variables, *p*-values, interpretation of the result, and the degree of relationship of the variables.

The correlation coefficient between teachers' work engagement and occupational burnout shows a weak positive relationship (*r* = .201) with a *p*-value of .001, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the correlation is statistically significant. The work engagement sub-variables show varying relationships with occupational burnout. Vigor has a weak positive and significant relationship (*r* = .253, *p* = .000), meaning that higher vigor is associated with higher burnout. In contrast, Dedication shows no significant correlation with burnout (*r* = .013, *p* = .835), because the *p*-value is greater than 0.05. Absorption shows a weak positive and significant relationship with burnout (*r* = .141, *p* = .026), as the *p*-value is below 0.05.

In terms of organizational behavior, the correlation analysis indicates that overall organizational behavior has a weak positive and significant relationship with teachers' occupational burnout (*r* = .247, *p* = .000). The organizational behavior sub-variables, autocratic shows a weak positive and significant correlation with burnout (*r* = .176, *p* = .005). Custodial also shows a weak positive and significant relationship (*r* = .243, *p* = .000). However, supportive shows no significant correlation with burnout (*r* = .032, *p* = .615), as *p* is greater than 0.05. Lastly, collegial also shows no significant correlation with burnout (*r* = .097, *p* = .127), since the *p*-value exceeds the 0.05 significance level.

**Table 4. Correlational Analysis**

	R-VALUE	PROBABILITY
Work Engagement	.201	.001**
Vigor	.253	.000**
Dedication	.013	.835
Absorption	.141	.026*
Organizational Behavior	.247	.000**
Autocratic	.176	.005**
Custodial	.243	.000**
Supportive	.032	.615
Collegial	.097	.127

Results indicate that teachers' work engagement is significantly and positively related to occupational burnout, suggesting a higher level of work engagement may be associated with increased demands that lead to stress and exhaustion. Vigor (*r* = .253, *p* = .000) and absorption (*r* = .141, *p* = .026) are significantly positively correlated with burnout, implying that teachers who are energetic and deeply engaged in their work are more likely to experience burnout over time. Dedication (*r* = .013, *p* = .835) was not significantly related to burnout, indicating that a strong sense of purpose does not always lead to exhaustion. It is therefore important for schools to have strategies in place to keep engagement levels without overloading teachers, such as workload and time management supports, stress-management and coping programs, mentoring and fostering healthy work-life boundaries, particularly for teachers with high vigor and deep absorption.

The results show a significant positive relationship between organizational behavior and occupational burnout in general ( $r = .247, p = .000$ ) with regard to organizational behavior. In particular, autocratic ( $r = .176, p = .005$ ) and custodial ( $r = .243, p = .000$ ) behaviors are significantly associated with higher occupational burnout. This suggests that more controlling organizational practices, which do not allow teachers to act autonomously, or which restrict decision-making, may increase teachers' stress and emotional strain. However, supportive ( $r = .032, p = .615$ ) and collegial ( $r = .097, p = .127$ ) behaviors are not significantly related to burnout in this study, although administrators may still want to consider strengthening them for overall wellbeing. Overall, it is recommended that school leaders revise and modify management practices towards more participative and empowering ones (e.g., shared decision making, autonomy in teaching tasks, and less excessive control) to help reduce occupational burnout among teachers.

This is in line with the study of Amorio et al. (2021) that states teacher work engagement particularly vigor and absorption can highly correlate to higher level of burnout when paired with excessive job demands. This "engaged-burnout" paradox is also corroborated by recent international and local research, where teachers who are highly invested in their work tend to experience emotional exhaustion, especially in cases where high workload depletes their cognitive and physical resources (Amorio et al., 2021; Angelini et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2025). In addition, studies show that while engagement can help with better stress management in some instances, it is not a permanent shield; continuous hindrance stressors often lower engagement levels and hasten the progression to burnout (Amorio et al., 2021; Cañete, 2025; Zhang et al., 2025).

The study of Amorio et al. (2021) shows that controlling, custodial and autocratic management styles are significant predictors of burnout by limiting the autonomy and freedom of teachers to decide. Furthermore, other studies have claimed that leadership mechanisms that emphasize participative decision-making, shared authority, and institutional support are important in decoupling organizational pressure from teacher exhaustion (Amorio et al., 2021; Cañete, 2025; Albino et al, 2025; see also, Wang et al., 2025). The transition to an empowering organizational culture that values supportive supervision over rigid surveillance provides school administrators a way to successfully combat the adverse effects of institutional demands on teachers' well-being.

### Predictors of Occupational Burnout

Table 5 presents the stepwise regression analysis to find the best predictors of teachers' occupational burnout. The table includes several variables, with constant term at 1.664 and standard error of 0.275, resulting in a t-value of 6.062 and a significant level of 0.000. The result show that work engagement in the form of vigor has a positive and significant effect on teachers' occupational burnout ( $B = .222, \text{Std. Error} = .063, \text{Beta} = .217, t = 3.544, \text{Sig.} = .000$ ). In addition, organizational behavior in terms of custodial show a positive and significant influence on occupational burnout ( $B = .149, \text{Std. Error} = .045, \text{Beta} = .205, t = 3.352, \text{Sig.} = .001$ ).

**Table 5. Regression Analysis**

VARIABLE	B	STD. ERROR	BETA	T	SIG.
(Constant)	1.664	.275		6.062	.000
Work engagement in terms of Vigor	.222	.063	.217	3.544	.000
Organizational behavior in terms of Custodial	.149	.045	.205	3.352	.001
R = 0.323		R <sup>2</sup> = 0.105		F-value = 14.424	
Probability = 0.000					

The regression model showed a correlation ( $R=0.323$ ) and a substantial proportion of variance explained ( $R^2 = 0.105$ ), meaning that approximately 10.5% of the variability on teachers' occupational burnout can be accounted for by the predictor variables. The overall F-value of 14.424 with a probability of 0.000, which is less than the significant level 0.05, confirms the model's statistical significance.

The results imply that there are two significant variables that predict teachers' occupational burnout, namely work engagement (vigor) and organizational behavior (custodial). Specifically, vigor has a positive and significant effect on burnout ( $B=.222, p=.000$ ), meaning that teachers who report higher energy, persistence and drive in their work are more likely to experience greater burnout. This implies that in these school contexts high effort may be coupled with sustained demands and limited recovery, so that energy and sustained involvement

can still result in exhaustion when stressors are ongoing. Similarly, the positive and significant impact of custodial organizational behavior ( $B=.149$ ,  $p=.001$ ) suggests that teachers may experience burnout even when leaders offer benefits and job security. This means that the deeper causes of burnout such as workload pressure, work strain, limited autonomy and inadequate psychosocial and professional support may not be fully addressed by security and welfare provisions.

Practically, the regression model ( $R=0.323$  and  $R^2=.105$ ) shows that these predictors explain some 10.5% of the variance of occupational burnout, confirming they are important but not the only factors involved. Therefore, school leaders should not depend on custodial strategies (benefits and job security) alone to prevent burnout. Instead, they should add measures that support teachers in managing sustained effort to welfare-oriented practices, including workload balancing, reducing role strain, strengthening supportive supervision, and creating opportunities for recovery. Furthermore, as vigor predicts burnout, interventions should focus on promoting healthy engagement, encouraging productive work habits and monitoring signs of overextension so teachers remain motivated without becoming emotionally and physically exhausted.

The findings are in line with the study by Angelini et al. (2024), showing that high work engagement, especially vigor, can be paradoxically linked to a higher risk of burnout for teachers who are exposed to chronic school-based stressors without adequate recovery periods. Research in international contexts indicates that vigor, although a marker of energy and drive, typically demands a substantial depletion of personal resources that, if not restored, leads to emotional exhaustion, rather than continued resilience (Angelini et al., 2024; Salmela-Aro et al., 2019). This is consistent with the findings of local researchers such as Cañete (2025) that Filipino teachers are often in a high-intensity commitment which, together with heavy non-teaching loads, directly causes symptoms of burnout.

The findings that custodial organizational behavior even when providing job security, fails to address the structural stressors that drive teacher burnout such as role overload, lack of autonomy, and limited psychosocial support confirms the study of Albino et al (2025). International and local evidence confirms that while material benefits are necessary, they cannot replace the psychological need for supportive supervision and participative management (Albino et al, 2025; Wang et al., 2025). Rather, these studies suggest leadership that distributes workload and empowers educators such that organizational practices are proactive in addressing, not ignoring, the complex demands that add to the professional strain of educators (Albino et al, 2025; Wang et al., 2025).

## CONCLUSION

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

Public school teachers manifest a high work engagement on their teaching career. The strongest is their dedication which shows strong purpose and meaning. This is followed by vigor which shows sustained energy and motivation. Absorption is somewhat lower, but still high, indicating that teachers are often involved, but sometimes their deep concentration may be interrupted. The overall result indicates that teachers' engagement and commitment may play a protective role in occupational burnout, and schools should enhance supportive practices to maintain engagement.

Public school teachers experienced high organizational behavior at their workplace with the strongest dimension being collegiality and supportiveness as the next strongest dimension. This suggests that teamwork, shared responsibility and guidance can often help teachers to feel better and to avoid the risks of burnout. However, the autocratic and custodial aspects were only at a moderate level which may suggest protective and security-related support may not be consistently felt. Schools should maintain collegial and supportive practices and improve the fairness, clarity, and consistency of welfare and job security commitments to teachers to better reduce burnout over time.

The findings demonstrated that public school teachers had a moderate level of occupational burnout overall. This suggest that burnout exists and it can impact on well-being and teaching effectiveness even though it is not yet severe in all dimensions. Personal achievement is still high, which indicates that many teachers still feel they are making a meaningful impact and being effective in their work which in turn protects them from a deeper burnout.

Meanwhile, emotional exhaustion is at a moderate level, indicating that teachers are experiencing fatigue and emotional depletion that can eat away at motivation if pressures continue. Depersonalization is low, so fewer teachers are becoming cynical or detached from students, but the moderate exhaustion requires early intervention to prevent it from worsening.

Work engagement and organizational behavior are significantly and positively correlated with teachers' occupational burnout, meaning that teachers with high levels of work engagement and organizational behavior tend to have high levels of burnout. In particular, the study finds that vigor and absorption are positively associated with burnout, whereas dedication is not. In this study, autocratic and custodial practices are significantly associated with higher burnout, whereas supportive and collegial behaviors are not significantly related to burnout for organizational behavior. Overall, the findings suggest that the "engaged-burnout" pattern may occur in the context of high demands for teacher involvement and organizational control. This highlights the need for schools to manage workload and move toward more empowering and less controlling practices to reduce burnout.

The occupational burnout of public school teachers is best predicted by two significant variables, namely work engagement in terms of vigor and organizational behavior in terms of custodial practices. Teachers with higher levels of vigor are more likely to experience higher burnout, suggesting that sustained energy and drive may be depleted when demands are persistent with no adequate recovery. Additionally, custodial organizational behavior is also a significant predictor of burnout, suggesting that only providing benefits and protection might not be enough to address the deeper workload and psychosocial stressors that lead to exhaustion. Overall, the model accounts for a meaningful part of the variance in burnout. This suggests that, in addition to material or security-based supports, school interventions should also manage sustained demands and reinforce recovery-based, supportive measures.

## REFERENCES

1. Albino, H.A., & Paglinawan, J.L. (2025). Organizational support and professional engagement on burn-out experiences of basic education teachers. *International Journal of Science and Management Research*, 8(12), 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2025.81211>
2. Amorio, J., & Torreon, L. (2021). Occupational burnout and work engagement-based management among teachers in public elementary schools. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 3(2), 32–40. <https://www.ajmrd.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/C322330.pdf>
3. Angelini, G., et al. (2024). Engaged teachers and well-being: The mediating role of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 109(2), 155–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2024.2404507>
4. Balois, A., et al. (2025). Teacher burnout and its relationship with classroom management. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(8), 375-382. <https://eprajournals.com/IJMR/article/17338>
5. Briones, M. R., Manaig, K. A., Bonganciso, R. T., Tesoro, J. F. B., Buama, C. A. C., Sarmiento, M. B., & Sapin, S. B. (2023). E-work self-efficacy, digital competence and work engagement of teachers in public secondary schools from two provinces in the Philippines. *HO CHI MINH CITY OPEN UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE - SOCIAL SCIENCES*, 13(2), 14-36. <https://doi.org/10.46223/hcmcoujs.soci.en.13.2.2747.2023>
6. Brown, S., & Biddle, J. (2023). Personal and professional factors that mitigate teacher burnout. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 32, 102104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104078>
7. Calora, E. A. R. (2020). Organizational behavior and its effect on the performance of public junior high school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research*, 4(7), 46–52. <http://ijeais.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/7/IJAPR200708.pdf>
8. Cañete, L. (2025). Workload and work engagement among the teachers in the Davao region. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 15(1), 22–35. <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/50954.pdf>
9. Collie, R. J., Granziera, H., & Martin, A. J. (2020). Linking teacher autonomy support, parental scaffolding, and student motivation: A multiple mediation model. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23(2), 437-458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.015>
10. David, N. G. R. M., Resuello, N. L. R., & Ancheta, N. M. G. (2024). Understanding the impact of national

- learning camps: Teacher volunteers' experiences, teaching methods, challenges, and student learning outcomes. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 21(1), 2182–2195. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0245>
11. DepEd. (2022). National Achievement Test results summary. Department of Education, Philippines.
  12. EDCOM 2. (2024). Removing the burden of administration from teachers. [https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2025/03/EDCOM2\\_Policy\\_Brief\\_Removing\\_the\\_Burden\\_of\\_Administrati\\_on\\_from\\_Teachers.pdf](https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2025/03/EDCOM2_Policy_Brief_Removing_the_Burden_of_Administrati_on_from_Teachers.pdf)
  13. Francisco, C., Tupaz, G., Astilla, M.T. (2024). Teacher burnout: The lived experiences of teachers with ancillary tasks. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Innovation*, 9(3), 846–855. <https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajmri/article/view/3380>
  14. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout vs. work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
  15. Kim, L. E., Jäger, J., Roth, A., Liebe, V., Gläser-Zikuda, M., & Strauss, B. (2022). Teachers' well-being and their (online) teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic: A latent profile analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103504> .
  16. Kim, L. E., Jörg, V., & Klassen, R. M. (2017). Dimensions of work engagement and teacher burnout. *ERIC Journal*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1169149.pdf> .
  17. Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., (2017). Teacher and teaching effects on students' attitudes and behaviors. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5602565/> .
  18. Ladres, K., & Garcia, N. (2025). Occupational stress and burnout towards teachers' turnover intention. *European Journal of Education Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6146>
  19. 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>
  20. Mäkelä, K., Hökka, P., & Eteläpelto, A. (2019). Profiles of work engagement and burnout among Finnish teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 123-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.006> .
  21. Maquidato, J., & Bayani, R. (2024). Workload and work engagement among teachers: A descriptive study. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. <https://eprajournals.com/IJCM/article/13639>
  22. Maslach, C., et al. (2020). MBI: Educators Survey. Mind Garden. <https://www.mindgarden.com/316-mbi-educators-survey>
  23. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Maslach Burnout Inventory: Validating factorial structure and invariance across educators. *PubMed*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26751023/>
  24. McLean, L., Connor, C. M., Chang, H., & Pisani, L. (2022). Stress, burnout, anxiety and depression among teachers: A scoping review. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3, 100144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100144>.
  25. McLean, L., McDonald, J. C., & Connor, C. M. (2023). Interventions to reduce stress and burnout among teachers: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 127, Article 104035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104035>.
  26. Mérida-López, S., Extremera, N., Pineda, D., & Rey, L. (2023). The role of teachers' socio-emotional competence in reducing burnout through increased work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1295365. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1295365>
  27. Oberlechner, M., & Polzl-Viol, V. (2022). Teacher burnout and collegiality at the workplace in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 12(10), 683. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12100683>
  28. OECD. (2018). PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What students know and can do. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
  29. Pabatang, O. J., Zabala, V., Amparo, J., Aquino, J., & Basa, G. (2022). Teachers' Burnout Levels and Coping Strategies in the Time of Pandemic: Basis for a Proposed Program to Manage Teachers Burnout. *Asia Research Network Journal of Education*, 2(3), 166–189. retrieved from <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/arnje/article/view/259702>
  30. Romero, M. (2021). School-based management among teachers in schools. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 3(2), 23–30. <https://www.ajmrd.com/>
  31. Salmela-Aro, K., Hietajärvi, L., & Lonka, K. (2019). Work burnout and engagement profiles among teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 2254. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02254> .

32. Schaufeli, W. B. (2024). Work engagement. In L. M. Lapierre & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of occupational health psychology* (pp. 210–213). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035313389.ch64>
33. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>.
34. Tarrayo, H. O. (2023). Teachers' workload policy: Its impact on Philippine public school teachers. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED629465.pdf>
35. TNTP. (2024). The impacts of teacher expectations on student outcomes. <https://tntp.org/publication/the-impacts-of-teacher-expectations-on-student-outcomes/>.
36. Tugrul, H., & Celik, B. (2021). Leadership styles and burnout among public school teachers in Bohol, Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 45(2), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pje.2021.45.2.89>
37. Upadyaya, A. K., Vartiainen, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2019). Work burnout and engagement profiles among teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 2254. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02254>.
38. Wang, H., et al. (2025). Exploring the relationship between teachers' perceived workload and work engagement. PMC. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11881279/>
39. Wang, Y. (2024). Exploring the impact of workload, organizational support, and work engagement on teacher well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10834696/>.
40. Zhang, Y., et al. (2025). Exploring the relationship between teachers' perceived workload and work engagement in primary and secondary schools. *Journal of Psychology and Educational Research*, 33(1), 12–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2025.2443056>
41. Zhang, Y., Ma, Y., Zhang, D., & Liu, L. (2022). Teacher career calling reduces burnout: The mediation effects of work engagement and teacher psychological capital. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 988467. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.988467>