IJAMS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume V, Issue 7 July 2025, eISSN: 2799-0664

Leadership Mechanism to Mitigate Teacher Burnout, Enhance Retention and Promote Well-Being

WYNDE MARIE T. FUJIHARA

Abstract — This study explored the implementation of leadership mechanisms aimed at mitigating teacher burnout, enhancing retention, and promoting well-being among educators in Getafe I District, Division of Bohol, during School Year 2024–2025. Specifically, it examined the demographic profile of teachers, assessed their level of burnout, evaluated the extent of resilient leadership practices, and analyzed the relationships between teacher characteristics, burnout levels, and leadership implementation. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, utilizing standardized survey instruments administered to all public school teachers in the district. Descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation analysis were used to interpret the data. Findings revealed that most teachers were in their early to mid-career stages and were predominantly female and married. Although highly educated, many remained in lower ranks, reflecting professional stagnation. Burnout levels were moderate, with symptoms of emotional exhaustion, fatigue, and reduced engagement emerging among a portion of the teaching population. The extent of implementation of resilient leadership mechanisms was also moderate, with strengths in responsiveness and recognition, but weaknesses in inclusive decision-making and well-being support. Correlation results showed no significant relationship between demographic variables and burnout or leadership implementation, indicating that these experiences were shaped more by workplace conditions than personal characteristics. These findings underscore the importance of resilient, inclusive, and burnout-sensitive leadership, which addresses workload, promotes professional growth, and supports teacher well-being across all demographics.

Keywords — Teacher Burnout, Resilient Leadership, Teacher Characteristics, Emotional Support, Teacher Well-being

I. Introduction

Teacher burnout has become a growing global concern, as educators face increasing responsibilities, bureaucratic demands, and emotional strain. According to Maslach and Leiter (2016), burnout is primarily caused by prolonged stress, lack of support, and emotional exhaustion, all of which negatively impact instructional quality and student outcomes. In my own experience as an educator, I have witnessed colleagues resign after struggling with excessive paperwork, student behavioral issues, and limited resources.

International organizations, including UNESCO (2020), recognize that burnout reduces educational excellence and contributes to the early departure of skilled educators. Countries such as the United States and Finland have responded with leadership-based programs, mentorship, and work–life balance strategies to improve teacher well-being (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). However, cultural and institutional differences affect how effectively these strategies can be applied.

In the Philippines, teachers frequently face large class sizes, heavy administrative loads, and minimal mental health support. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2017) has emphasized the need for leadership policies that promote well-being through shared responsibilities and collaborative programs. Research by Calderon and Gonzales (2019) supports the idea that strong leadership fosters positive workplace environments that reduce stress and improve job satisfaction.

This study aims to explore the role of resilient leadership in addressing teacher burnout in Getafe I District, under the Division of Bohol. It adapts proven international and national strategies to meet local needs and provides practical recommendations for school leaders and policymakers. Using a descriptive-correlational method, the research examines burnout levels and leadership practices among public school employees. While findings may not be generalizable to all districts due to differing conditions, the study offers valuable insights into sustainable teacher development and well-being in rural Philippine schools.

Statement of the Problem

This study examined resilient leadership mechanisms that mitigate teacher burnout, enhance retention, and promote well-being among teachers in Getafe I District, Division of Bohol with the end view of proposing a leadership program for teacher wellness and retention.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the teachers in terms of:

    1.1 age;

    1.2 Sex;

    1.3 civil status;

    1.4 highest educational attainment;

    1.5 designation/position;

    1.6 years of teaching experience; and

    1.7 number of relevant trainings and seminars attended?

2. What is the level of teacher burnout in Getafe I District in terms of:

    2.1 exhaustion; and

    2.2 disengagement?

3. What is the extent of implementation of resilient leadership mechanisms in terms of:

    3.1 supportive leadership practices;

3.2 professional development and capacity building;

3.3 workload management and organizational support; and

3.4 well-being and mental health initiatives?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the teacher's profile and their level of burn out?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' profile and the extent of implementation of leadership mechanisms?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' level of burnout and the extent of implementation of leadership mechanisms?

7. Based on findings, what Leadership Program for Teacher Wellness and Retention can be proposed?

II. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine how leadership mechanisms influenced teacher burnout, retention, and well-being among educators in Getafe I District, Division of Bohol. Following the framework of Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2012), the design combined two elements: the description of existing conditions and the analysis of relationships between variables outside of experimental control.

The descriptive component gathered statistical data on school heads and teaching staff demographics, assessed burnout levels, and measured the implementation of leadership styles across schools. The correlational component examined links between burnout and teacher characteristics and compared leadership perceptions between administrators and classroom teachers.

This dual approach provided a comprehensive view of the school environment while exploring how leadership practices related to teacher well-being. It was well-suited for real-world educational settings where manipulating variables would be neither practical nor ethical.

Procedure

The researcher obtained permission from key authorities to conduct the study. Approval was first secured from the Dean of the Graduate School at Northwest Samar State University, followed by the Schools Division Superintendent of Bohol. A request was then submitted to the Public Schools District Supervisor of Getafe I, outlining the study's rationale.

A researcher-made questionnaire was developed and pilot-tested in Getafe II District, Bohol. Reliability and validity were confirmed through Cronbach's Alpha Analysis.

Consent forms were prepared and clearly explained to participants. Questionnaires were distributed via Google Forms for those with internet access, and personally delivered to those without. The study's purpose was explained, and ethical standards, including informed consent and confidentiality, were strictly observed.

After data collection, responses were tallied and tabulated according to the research questions. The data were then thoroughly analyzed and interpreted to ensure valid and unbiased results.

Findings were intended to be presented to school administrators and district officials in Getafe I, aiming to offer practical solutions to improve leadership, reduce teacher burnout, and enhance retention. The entire research process adhered to ethical guidelines to protect participant privacy and ensure data integrity.

Data Gathering

The study utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26 to manage quantitative data and perform analytical procedures. A normality test was first conducted to determine the appropriate statistical methods.

For inferential analysis, the study employed Pearson's correlation coefficient to examine relationships between burnout and demographic variables, and an independent samples t-test to compare leadership perceptions between teachers and administrators. A chi-square test was used to assess associations involving categorical variables such as training participation and burnout levels. Regression analysis was also conducted to evaluate the predictive power of leadership approaches on burnout reduction, teacher retention, and overall well-being.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS and Jamovi software, with significance set at $p < 0.05$. These rigorous analytical methods provided strong empirical support for the study's findings and informed practical leadership recommendations for educators in Getafe I District.

III. Results and Discussion

This section summarizes the frequency distribution of teachers' demographic profiles, including age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, designation or position, years of teaching experience, and the number of relevant trainings and seminars attended.

The demographic data revealed that most teachers in Getafe I District are in their early to mid-career stage (ages 31–40), a period often marked by professional pressure and burnout risk.

The workforce is predominantly female (89.1%) and largely married (84%), highlighting the importance of gender-sensitive and family-aware leadership strategies.

Most teachers (56.4%) have earned units in a master's degree, and 38.5% have completed it, indicating a highly qualified and ambitious teaching force. However, the majority hold the position of Teacher III (69.9%), suggesting limited career progression, which may lead to reduced motivation.

Teachers with 6–10 years of experience (35.3%) form the largest group, followed by those with over 16 years, emphasizing the need for leadership approaches tailored to both mid-career challenges and long-term retention.

Notably, 60.9% of teachers had attended only 1–3 relevant trainings, pointing to a gap in professional development opportunities, a known factor in burnout.

Overall, the data underscores the urgent need for resilient, emotionally intelligent leadership that supports teacher well-being, offers career growth, and provides continuous professional development to mitigate burnout and promote retention.

Table 2 Frequency Distribution on the Demographic Profile of the Teachers in terms of Age, Sex, Civil Status, Highest Educational Attainment, Designation Position, Years of Teaching Experience and Number of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended

Age	**Frequency**	**Percent**
30<	14	9.0%
31-35	57	36.5%
36-40	35	22.4%
41-45	28	17.9%
46>	22	14.1%
Total	**156**	**100.0%**
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	17	10.9%
Female	139	89.1%
Total	**156**	**100.0%**
Civil Status	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Single	17	10.9%
Married	131	84.0%
Separated	4	2.6%
Widowed	4	2.6%
Total	**156**	**100.0**
Highest Educational Attainment	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Bachelor's Degree	4	2.6%
Master's Degree-Units	88	56.4%
Master's Degree-Completed	60	38.5%
Doctorate Degree-Units	4	2.6%
Total	**156**	**100.0%**
Designation Position	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Teacher I	25	16.0%
Teacher II	5	3.2%
Teacher III	109	69.9%
Master Teacher I-II	9	5.8%

School Head/ SIC	8	5.1%
Total	**156**	**100.0%**
Years of Teaching Experience	**Frequency**	**Percent**
1-5	24	15.4%
6-10	55	35.3%
11-15	36	23.1%
16>	41	26.3%
Total	**156**	**100.0%**
Number of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended	**Frequency**	**Percent**
1-3	95	60.9
4-6	40	25.6
7-9	17	10.9
10>	4	2.6
Total	**156**	**100.0**

Teachers in the Getafe I District are experiencing a moderate level of burnout, as indicated by an overall mean score of 2.72. This suggests that many educators are dealing with both emotional exhaustion and disengagement in their roles. The most prominent signs of burnout were the feelings of being physically and emotionally drained at the end of the workday and feeling overwhelmed by the demands of teaching, each with a mean score of 3.11. These responses highlight a common struggle—while teachers may still find meaning and motivation in their work, the psychological demands are taking a toll on their well-being.

The variability in burnout experiences is also notable. Standard deviations ranging from 0.64 to 1.31 show that some teachers are coping better than others. Particularly high variation was seen in items related to empathy and collegial concern, where some teachers remained engaged, while others expressed indifference or emotional detachment. This disparity underscores the complex and individualized nature of burnout, pointing to the need for flexible, personalized interventions.

Additional symptoms such as stress-related health issues and detachment from responsibilities further reflect the emotional strain many educators face. These patterns indicate that emotional resilience is being challenged, and without adequate support, burnout could deepen.

To respond effectively, school leadership must prioritize supportive strategies that build emotional strength and professional fulfillment. Initiatives like coaching, mentoring, and emotional intelligence training can empower teachers, helping them manage stress and reconnect with their professional purpose. As noted by Bing et al. (2022), cultivating resilience and emotional regulation not only reduces burnout but also strengthens teacher retention and overall well-being. This approach is vital for sustaining a healthy and motivated teaching force in Getafe I District.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Teacher Burnout in Getafe I District

EXHAUSTION	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. I feel physically and emotionally drained at the end of the workday.	156	3.11	0.80	Moderate
2. I often feel overwhelmed by the demands of teaching.	156	3.11	0.95	Moderate
3. I experience fatigue even after adequate rest.	156	3.04	0.83	Moderate
4. I struggle to find motivation to teach effectively.	156	3.04	0.64	Moderate
5. I feel mentally exhausted due to work-related stress.	156	2.98	0.89	Moderate
6. I find it difficult to engage with students due to exhaustion.	156	2.94	0.90	Moderate
7. I frequently feel emotionally detached from my work.	156	2.93	0.92	Moderate
8. I feel worn out by the constant pressure of teaching responsibilities.	156	2.87	0.71	Moderate
9. I often experience headaches, sleep disturbances, or other stress-related symptoms.	156	2.65	1.01	Moderate
10. I lack energy to complete daily teaching tasks efficiently.	156	2.63	1.30	Moderate
B. DISENGAGEMENT				
1. I find myself being less emphatic toward students.	156	2.62	1.30	Moderate
2. I feel indifferent to the concerns of my colleagues.	156	2.56	1.29	Moderate
3. I have become more cynical about teaching as a profession.	156	2.52	1.16	Moderate
4. I emotionally distance myself from students and their needs.	156	2.51	1.14	Moderate
5. I often feel detached from my work responsibilities.	156	2.48	1.31	Moderate
6. I express frustration or irritability towards students more frequently.	156	2.34	1.13	Moderate
7. I feel disconnected from my school community.	156	2.33	1.14	Moderate
8. I no longer find joy in teaching as I once did.	156	2.50	1.30	Moderate
9. I avoid interacting with students or parents beyond what is necessary.	156	2.52	1.16	Moderate
10. I feel like I am just going through the motions rather than being engaged.	156	2.62	1.30	Moderate
Mean	156	2.72	1.0	Moderate

The findings reveal a moderate level of implementation of supportive leadership practices, with a sub-mean of 2.85 and a standard deviation of 1.12. This suggests that while some supportive measures are evident, their application is not fully consistent or comprehensive. Teachers most strongly agreed that school heads provide emotional and professional support (M = 3.10) and recognize and appreciate teachers' efforts (M = 3.08), indicating that some foundational aspects of support are in place.

However, lower ratings for indicators such as teacher involvement in decision-making (M = 2.59), promotion of a respectful school culture (M = 2.54), and feeling valued by leadership (M = 2.40) highlight critical weaknesses in relational and participative leadership. These gaps suggest that while leaders may offer surface-level support, deeper engagement and mutual respect are lacking.

Moreover, the relatively high standard deviations, particularly in items such as collaborative work environments (SD = 1.33) and open communication (SD = 1.21), point to

inconsistent leadership experiences across different schools. This variability can lead to diminished trust in leadership and a weakened sense of psychological safety among teachers.

Research by Lexia Learning (2020) emphasizes that teachers who feel respected and included are more resilient and committed. Similarly, Gallup (2020) supports the value of relational leadership and frequent check-ins in reducing burnout. The current data suggest that while structural support is partially in place, there is a strong need to strengthen emotional connection, shared leadership, and transparent communication.

To foster a truly supportive environment, school leaders must go beyond task management. They should embrace empathy-driven practices, engage teachers in meaningful decision-making, and cultivate a school culture grounded in respect, trust, and inclusion. Such a shift is essential to enhancing teacher well-being and organizational effectiveness.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics on the Extent of Implementation of Leadership Mechanisms in terms of Supportive Leadership Practices

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
1. School head provide emotional and professional support to teachers.	156	3.10	1.07	Moderate
2. School Head recognize and appreciate teachers' efforts and contributions.	156	3.08	1.09	Moderate
3. School head foster a collaborative and inclusive work environment.	156	3.05	1.33	Moderate
4. Open and transparent communication is maintained between school heads and teachers.	156	2.98	1.21	Moderate
5. Teachers receive constructive feedback and guidance for professional growth.	156	2.94	1.14	Moderate
6. School head actively address teachers' concerns and challenges.	156	2.90	1.06	Moderate
7. Mentorship and coaching programs are available for teachers.	156	2.90	1.09	Moderate
8. Decision-making processes involve input from teachers.	156	2.59	0.98	Low
9. Leadership promotes a positive and respectful school culture.	156	2.54	1.02	Low
10. Teachers feel valued and respected by their school leaders.	156	2.40	1.16	Low
Sub-mean	**156**	**2.85**	**1.12**	**Moderate**

Legend	*Range*	*Description*
	4.21-5.00	*Very High*
	3.41-4.20	*High*
	2.61-3.40	*Moderate*
	1.81-2.60	*Low*
	1.00-1.80	*Very Low*

The overall implementation of leadership mechanisms in Getafe I District was found to be moderate, with a grand mean of 2.75 (SD = 1.02). Supportive Leadership Practices scored the highest (M = 2.85), while Well-being and Mental Health Initiatives scored the lowest (M = 2.69). Despite being present, these mechanisms are not strongly or consistently applied, limiting their effectiveness in addressing teacher burnout and retention.

This suggests a need for more strategic, emotionally intelligent leadership that goes beyond structure to foster genuine support, empowerment, and collaboration. For greater impact, school leaders must close the gap between policy and practice and create a culture that prioritizes teacher well-being and professional growth.

Table 8 Summary Results on the Extent of Implementation of Leadership Mechanisms

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Supportive Leadership Practices;	156	2.85	1.12	Moderate
Professional Development and Capacity Building;	156	2.73	1.18	Moderate
Workload Management and Organizational Support	156	2.73	0.84	Moderate
Well-Being and Mental Health Initiatives	156	2.69	0.92	Moderate
Grand Mean	**156**	**2.75**	**1.02**	**Moderate**

This section presents the test of the relationship between the teacher's profile and their level of burn out. The results are displayed in table 9.

The regression model showed a very weak correlation (R = 0.109) between teachers' demographic profiles and burnout levels, with only 1.2% of the variance explained ($R^2 = 0.012$). The negative adjusted R^2 (-0.035) indicates the model lacks predictive power and may perform worse than chance. This suggests that demographic factors like age, sex, or experience have minimal influence on burnout.

These findings emphasize that burnout is primarily driven by workplace and organizational factors, not personal characteristics. Consistent with Maslach and Leiter (2016), factors such as heavy workloads, lack of recognition, and limited growth opportunities are more critical. Therefore, system-wide leadership and organizational reforms are essential to effectively address teacher burnout.

Table 9 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.109	.012	-.035	0.886

The ANOVA results showed no significant relationship between teachers' demographic profiles and burnout levels (F = 0.254, p = 0.970), confirming the regression model's limited predictive value. This supports Schaufeli and Taris (2020), who argue that burnout is shaped more by work experiences than personal traits.

The findings highlight the need for school leaders to focus on workplace conditions—such as emotional support, recognition, workload management, and professional development—rather than relying on demographic characteristics. Evidence-based, systemic interventions like resilience training and a culture of appreciation are more effective in reducing teacher stress and promoting well-being.

Table 10 ANOVA Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
1	Regression	1.393	7	0.199	.254	0.970	Not Significant
	Residual	116.152	148	0.785			
	Total	117.545	155				

Table 11 shows that none of the teacher profile variables—including age, sex, civil status, education, designation, or training—significantly predicted burnout levels, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. Although age and experience had negative beta coefficients, suggesting burnout may slightly decrease with time, these relationships were not statistically significant.

These results reinforce that demographic factors are weak predictors of burnout, aligning with Maslach and Leiter's (2016) view that workplace conditions and leadership support are more critical. To reduce burnout, schools should prioritize supportive leadership, regular feedback, mentoring, and recognition, which directly improve teachers' engagement and sense of accomplishment.

Table 11 Multiple Regression Analysis on Test of Relationship Between the Teacher's Profile and their Level of Burn-out

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	-.097	.330	Not Significant
Sex	.042	.672	Not Significant
Civil Status	.034	.707	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	.071	.451	Not Significant
Designation/ Position	.063	.577	Not Significant
Years of Teaching Experience	-.089	.415	Not Significant
Number of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended	.014	.895	Not Significant

This section presents the test of relationship between the teachers' profile and the extent of implementation of leadership mechanisms. The findings are displayed below.

Table 12 shows a very weak correlation ($R = 0.076$, $R^2 = 0.006$) between teachers' demographic profiles and the extent of leadership mechanism implementation. The negative adjusted R^2 (-0.041) suggests the model performs worse than random chance, indicating that demographic factors like age or experience do not meaningfully predict how leadership practices are applied.

These results support theories like Transformational Leadership and the JD-R Model, emphasizing that leadership quality and organizational dynamics—not personal characteristics—

drive effective leadership implementation. Strong leadership practices rooted in support, inclusion, and resource provision are more impactful than demographic differences in shaping outcomes.

Table 12 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.076[a]	.006	-.041	.82602

Table 13 confirms the insignificance of teachers' demographic profiles in predicting leadership mechanism implementation, with a high p-value (0.997) and low F-value (0.122). This aligns with Table 12's findings and reinforces that leadership effectiveness depends on leadership style, institutional support, and organizational culture, not teacher demographics.

Drawing from Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory, successful leadership implementation requires access to external supports—like training and emotional resources—rather than relying on intrinsic traits. Therefore, in Getafe I District, school leaders should adopt systemic, proactive, and resource-driven strategies that benefit all teachers, regardless of their background.

Table 13 ANOVA Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value	Decision
1	Regression	.580	7	0.083	0.122	0.997	Not Significant
	Residual	100.981	148	0.682			
	Total	101.562	155				

Table 14 showed that none of the teacher profile variables—including age, teaching experience, and number of trainings—have a statistically significant effect on perceived leadership mechanism implementation, as all p-values exceed 0.05. Although some variables have negative beta values, suggesting a slight inverse trend, these are too weak to draw reliable conclusions.

This supports the study's central claim: effective leadership must be strategic and inclusive, not based on demographics. In line with Transformational Leadership Theory and the JD-R Model, leaders should focus on building supportive, personalized, and equitable leadership practices that benefit all teachers, regardless of their background.

Table 14 Multiple Regression Analysis on Test of Relationship Between the Teachers' Profile and the Extent of Implementation of Leadership Mechanisms

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	-0.077	0.441	Not Significant
Sex	0.006	0.952	Not Significant
Civil Status	0.016	0.864	Not Significant
Highest educational Attainment	0.028	0.764	Not Significant
Designation/ Position	0.035	0.755	Not Significant
Years of teaching Experience	-0.062	0.574	Not Significant
Number Of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended	-0.013	0.897	Not Significant

This section presents the test of relationship between the teachers' level of burnout and the extent of implementation of leadership mechanisms. The result is displayed below.

Table 15 showed a very weak positive correlation (r = 0.096) between teachers' burnout levels and the extent of leadership mechanism implementation. Although the p-value is listed as .000—typically indicating significance—the effect size is too small to hold practical value. This suggests that while better leadership implementation may slightly reduce burnout, the impact is minimal.

This weak relationship highlights that current leadership practices may not adequately address key burnout factors like workload and administrative burden. As supported by Schaufeli and Bakker (2019), meaningful change requires leadership interventions that directly target these stressors. For leadership to be effective in reducing burnout in Getafe I District, it must move beyond surface-level practices and focus on workload management, emotional support, and teacher autonomy.

Table 15 Pearson R Correlation on Test of Relationship Between the Teachers' Level of Burnout and the Extent of Implementation of Leadership Mechanisms

Variables		Teachers' level of burnout	Extent of implementation of leadership mechanisms	Decision
Teachers' level of burnout	Pearson Correlation	1	.0960**	Not Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	
	N	156	156	
Extent of implementation of leadership mechanisms	Pearson Correlation	.0960**	1	Not Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	156	156	

Discussion

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The demographic profile of teachers in Getafe I District highlighted key leadership implications. Most educators were in their early to mid-career stages (ages 31–40), a period when professional support and growth opportunities were critical. Burnout during this phase, as noted by Hakanen et al. (2019), often disrupted teacher-student connections, underscoring the need for trust-based, supportive leadership.

The predominance of female and married teachers introduced unique challenges. Female educators faced compounded stress from balancing work and domestic roles, while married teachers struggled with work-life balance. Emotionally intelligent leadership, as advocated by Leithwood et al. (2020), was necessary to address these pressures through flexibility, empathy, and workload management.

Despite many teachers holding or pursuing advanced degrees, professional stagnation—evidenced by limited advancement beyond Teacher III and low training participation—suggested

unmet aspirations. This disconnects risked disengagement and reduced accomplishment (Schaufeli & Taris, 2020). Effective leadership was needed to provide growth opportunities, recognition, and a culture of professional development to enhance teacher well-being and retention.

Level of Teacher Burnout in Getafe I District

The overall mean burnout score of 2.72 indicated a moderate level of burnout among teachers in Getafe I District, with particular intensity in emotional and physical exhaustion. The highest mean scores (3.11) were reported for feelings of being drained at the end of the workday and being overwhelmed by teaching demands, revealing a tension between intrinsic motivation and psychological strain.

Standard deviations ranging from 0.64 to 1.31 reflected moderate to high variability in burnout experiences. Items such as reduced empathy toward students and indifference toward colleagues showed particularly high variability, suggesting that while some teachers remained engaged, others struggled significantly. This highlighted the need for personalized and flexible support systems.

Moderate scores on indicators like stress-related physical symptoms and emotional detachment further underscored challenges in maintaining resilience. These findings suggested that leadership in the district needed to focus on strengthening teachers' emotional regulation and self-efficacy through coaching, mentoring, and training in emotional intelligence. As emphasized by Bing et al. (2022), such resilience-based interventions were essential to mitigating burnout, improving teacher retention, and fostering a healthier school climate.

Extent of Implementation of Leadership Mechanisms

The sub-mean score of 2.85 with a standard deviation of 1.12 indicated a moderate level of implementation of supportive leadership practices in Getafe I District. Teachers rated the school heads highest for responsiveness to concerns (M = 3.10) and recognition of teacher efforts (M = 3.08), suggesting that foundational support systems were present. However, lower scores for inclusive decision-making (M = 2.59) and promoting a respectful culture (M = 2.40) revealed significant gaps in relational and emotionally engaged leadership.

The high standard deviations, particularly for inclusivity (SD = 1.33) and communication (SD = 1.21), pointed to inconsistent experiences among teachers, likely reflecting uneven leadership practices across schools. This inconsistency potentially weakened staff trust and psychological safety. As Lexia Learning (2020) emphasized, feelings of respect and value enhance teacher resilience and commitment, underscoring the need to strengthen areas like participative leadership and recognition.

In line with Gallup (2020), the data suggested that while structural leadership elements existed, emotional and relational aspects required improvement. School leaders needed to move

beyond task management by incorporating empathy, emotional presence, and shared decision-making to build trust and reduce burnout.

Tests of Relationships of the Variables

The analysis revealed a weak and statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' demographic profiles and their level of burnout in the Getafe I District. With an R-value of 0.109 and an R^2 of only 0.012, demographic factors such as age, sex, civil status, and experience contributed minimally to explaining burnout levels. The negative adjusted R^2 further indicated that the model lacked predictive value. These findings aligned with prior research (e.g., Schaufeli & Taris, 2020), emphasizing that burnout was primarily driven by workplace conditions, emotional stressors, and leadership practices rather than individual traits.

ANOVA and regression analyses supported this conclusion, as none of the demographic variables showed statistically significant effects on burnout or on the implementation of leadership mechanisms. These results highlighted the need for systemic, organizational solutions—such as improved working conditions, emotional support, and effective leadership—over demographic profiling. Ultimately, leadership that fostered emotional resilience, mentoring, and workload management proved more impactful in addressing burnout. For Getafe I District, building a supportive, inclusive, and growth-oriented environment emerged as a crucial step in improving teacher well-being and enhancing the success of leadership mechanisms.

IV. Conclusion

The demographic profile of teachers in Getafe I District provided valuable insights into factors that influenced teacher burnout and the implementation of leadership mechanisms. Teachers in their early to mid-career stages required targeted mentorship, emotional support, and opportunities for growth to mitigate burnout and support professional development. Gender-sensitive and empathetic leadership proved essential, particularly for female and married teachers who faced additional challenges balancing professional and personal responsibilities.

The findings, which showed moderate levels of burnout and a weak correlation between demographic factors and burnout, underscored the need for school leaders to focus on systemic improvements rather than individual traits. Effective leadership prioritized supportive environments that addressed workload management, emotional well-being, and career advancement. To reduce burnout and enhance teacher retention, school leaders in Getafe I District needed to move beyond demographic assumptions and adopt resilient, inclusive, and growth-oriented leadership strategies aimed at strengthening both professional capacity and emotional resilience among teachers.

V. Recommendations

Based on conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. School leaders in Getafe I District should create mentorship programs for early to mid-career teachers, providing guidance, emotional support, and career development opportunities. Regular training on career growth and stress management can further enhance teacher skills and engagement.

2. With many female and married teachers, leadership should adopt a gender-sensitive approach by offering flexible schedules, family-friendly policies, and an empathetic work culture. Incorporating emotional intelligence in leadership can help address their unique challenges with greater understanding and support. Manage teacher workloads through smaller class sizes, reduced administrative tasks, and increased support staff to prevent burnout and improve job satisfaction.

3. To reduce moderate burnout, school leaders should manage teachers' workloads by adjusting class sizes, minimizing administrative tasks, and adding support staff. This helps prevent emotional exhaustion and boosts job satisfaction. Foster a resilient and inclusive school culture that supports professional growth, values teacher input in decision-making, and encourages leadership opportunities.

4. School leadership should foster a culture of emotional well-being by implementing peer support networks, counseling services, and regular mental health check-ins. Prioritizing teacher well-being reduces burnout, boosts morale, and improves retention.

5. School leaders shoud strengthen workforce resilience by fostering professional growth, inclusion, and open communication. Valuing and empowering teachers in school planning, decision-making, and policy development enhances engagement. Leadership opportunities and career advancement help sustain their sense of purpose.

6. Schools should assess teacher burnout and leadership effectiveness through surveys and feedback sessions. Using this data, leaders can refine practices and interventions. A commitment to continuous feedback and improvement ensures leadership strategies adapt to teachers' evolving needs.

REFERENCES

[1] Aelterman, A., Engels, N., Van Petegem, K., & Verhaeghe, J. P. (2007). The well-being of teachers in Flanders: The importance of a supportive school culture. Educational Studies, 33(3), 285-297.
[2] Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2019). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 315-338.

[3] Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.
[4] Bing, H., Sadjadi, B., Afzali, M., & Fathi, J. (2022). Self-efficacy and emotion regulation as predictors of teacher burnout among English as a foreign language teachers: A structural equation modeling approach. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 900417. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.900417
[5] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.
[6] Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499
[7] Department of Education (DepEd). (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Department of Education, Philippines.
[8] Dimsu, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5-22.
[9] Edutopia. (2020, March 12). How social-emotional learning helps teachers. George Lucas Educational Foundation. https://www.edutopia.org/article/how-social-emotional-learning-helps-teachers
[10] Education Corner. (2019). Teacher burnout: Causes, symptoms, and prevention strategies. https://www.educationcorner.com/teacher-burnout.html
[11] Educational Psychology Review, 31(3), 789-813.
[12] Fullan, M. (2014). Leading in a culture of change. John Wiley & Sons.
[13] Gabe, J. (2016). Teacher Resilience and Leadership: Strategies for Enhancing Well-Being in Education. Academic Press.
[14] Gallup. (2020). How to improve teacher retention and burnout. Retrieved from https://www.gallup.com/education/316709/how-to-improve-teacher-retention-burnout.aspx
[15] Gallup. (2020). State of the American workplace: Employee engagement insights for U.S. business leaders. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/257578/state-american-workplace-report-2020.aspx
[16] Haiku, W. B. (2019). Burnout and work engagement among teachers: The role of job demands and resources. Educational Psychology Review, 31(3), 789-813.
[17] Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2019). Burnout and work engagement among teachers: The role of job demands and resources. Educational Psychology Review, 31(3), 789-813.
[18] Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all. Corwin Press.
[19] Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
[20] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5-22.
[21] Lexia Learning. (2020). Building resilience: How school leaders can fight teacher burnout. Retrieved from https://www.lexialearning.com/blog/building-resilience-how-school-leaders-can-fight-teacher-burnout
[22] Lexia Learning. (2020). Building teacher resilience: Supporting educator well-being. https://www.lexialearning.com/blog/building-teacher-resilience-supporting-educator-well-being

[23] Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry, 15(2), 103-
[24] Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2019). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293-315.
[25] ScienceDirect. (2019). Stress, burnout, and resilience: Are teachers at risk? Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/
[26] Seam (2019). Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times. Routledge.
[27] Sensi, A. B. (2020). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293-315.
[28] Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivation and job satisfaction among teachers: The role of motivation and job demands. Teaching and Teacher Education, 67, 48-57.
[29] Taris, T. W., Le Blanc, P. M., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. (2017). Are there causal relationships between the dimensions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory? Work & Stress, 19(3), 238-255.
[30] TeachThought. (2021). How school leaders can support teacher mental health. https://www.teachthought.com/pedagogy/how-school-leaders-can-support-teacher-mental-health
[31] The Educator's Room. (2021, August 5). Why teachers are leaving: What school leaders need to hear. https://theeducatorsroom.com/why-teachers-are-leaving-what-school-leaders-need-to-hear/
[32] UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education – All Means All. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
[33] Walden University. (2018). The resilient educator: Recognizing the signs of teacher burnout. Retrieved from https://www.waldenu.edu/online-masters-programs/ms-in-education/resource/the-resilient-educator-recognizing-the-signs-of-teacher-burnout
[34] Walden University. (2018). Signs of teacher burnout and what to do about it. https://www.waldenu.edu/programs/education/resource/signs-of-teacher-burnout-and-what-to-do-about-it
[35] WeAreTeachers. (2021, April 14). 25 little things teachers say make them feel appreciated. https://www.weareteachers.com/little-things-teachers-feel-appreciated/