

The Nexus Between Teacher's Workload Allocation and Students' Learning Outcomes in the Implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in Public Secondary Schools of Alabat Island, Division of Quezon

¹Christian H. Atienza, ²Leodegario M. Jalos Jr.

¹Department of Education, Region IV-A CALABARZON, Division of Quezon Province, ²Marinduque State University

¹christian.atienza@deped.gov.ph, ²leodegariojalos74@gmail.com

Article Details:

Received: 21 February 2026

Revised: 1 April 2026

Accepted: 15 April 2026

Published: 26 April 2026

Corresponding Email:

christian.atienza@deped.gov.ph

Recommended Citation:

Atienza, C. H., Jalos Jr., L. M. (2026). The Nexus Between Teacher's Workload Allocation and Students' Learning Outcomes in the Implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in Public Secondary Schools of Alabat Island, Division of Quezon. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*. 1 (4), 461-499.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19789719>

Index Terms:

teacher's workload allocation, students' learning outcomes, DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments non-teaching related assignments, public secondary schools, Alabat Island

Abstract. This study investigated the nexus between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes in the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in public secondary schools on Alabat Island, Division of Quezon. Specifically, it examined workload allocation in terms of teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments. It also determined the level of students' learning outcomes based on academic grades, examined the significant relationship between workload allocation and learning outcomes, and identified the challenges encountered by teachers and the strategies they applied. The study employed a quantitative correlational research design. Data were gathered from 131 teacher-respondents out of 248 teachers across eleven public secondary schools through a validated four-part questionnaire and document analysis of students' first and second quarter academic grades. The data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's r. Findings revealed that teachers' workload allocation was generally regulated but remained demanding, particularly in terms of class size and ancillary tasks, which were found to operate at the upper limits of the policy allowance. Students' learning outcomes were generally described as Very Satisfactory. Notably, the results revealed no significant relationship between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes, indicating that the workload indicators examined did not directly predict students' academic performance. Despite this, teachers encountered moderate challenges and applied adaptive strategies such as time management, collaboration, technology use, and boundary setting. The study concluded that while workload allocation did not significantly influence students' learning outcomes, maintaining balanced workload policies remains essential to sustain instructional quality, strengthen teacher well-being, and support effective implementation of DepEd policies.

Introduction

In recent years, the global education sector has faced rising demands for quality instruction and stronger students' learning outcomes, which has increased expectations on teachers to deliver effective, responsive, and learner centered instruction despite expanding professional demands. Research also shows that excessive workload, especially when teaching responsibilities are combined with ancillary and administrative duties, can weaken instructional efficiency, job satisfaction, and teacher well-being.

In the Philippine context, this concern is especially pronounced because public school teachers often perform multiple responsibilities beyond classroom teaching. Teachers have long reported that non-teaching and administrative tasks

reduce the time available for lesson preparation, learner support, and professional growth. In response, the Department of Education issued DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024 to remove administrative tasks from public school teachers, and later issued DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024 to rationalize teachers' workload and provide compensation for teaching overload. DepEd Memorandum No. 053, s. 2024 was then released to provide the implementation guidelines for DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024 and to clarify how the policy should be applied in schools and divisions.

However, national evidence indicates that these reforms have not yet fully resolved the problem. Recent policy analysis and field evidence show that teachers continue to work long hours and still carry substantial ancillary and school related responsibilities, especially in settings with limited staffing and high operational demands. At the same time, DepEd has responded through complementary measures, including the hiring and renewal of school based administrative support staff under contract of service and the downloading of additional Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses to support these personnel, with the clear purpose of freeing teachers from paperwork and allowing them to focus more on teaching and student engagement.

Importantly, as of 6 April 2026, no new 2025 central office DepEd Order or DepEd Memorandum was found on the official DepEd issuances pages that formally amended or changed the text of DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024 and DepEd Memorandum No. 053, s. 2024. Instead, the 2025 issuances located on official DepEd sites were complementary and operational in nature. These included DepEd Order No. 006, s. 2025 on the streamlining of school forms and reports accomplished by teachers, the Teacher Workload Policy Toolkit disseminated in 2025, the 2025 guidelines on the renewal and hiring of school based administrative support staff under contract of service, and reminders on teaching overload processing and utilization reports. These measures strengthened implementation, reduced paperwork, and supported day-to-day execution of the policy, but they did not formally revise the substantive provisions of DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024 or DepEd Memorandum No. 053, s. 2024.

For this reason, the present study continues to use DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024 as the main subject of inquiry, with DepEd Memorandum No. 053, s. 2024 serving as its key implementation guide. This is methodologically appropriate because the governing policy framework on teachers' workload had not been formally replaced or amended by a new central office issuance in 2025. Thus, any examination of teachers' workload allocation and its connection to students' learning outcomes in public secondary schools on Alabat Island remains properly anchored in DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024, since it continued to stand as the controlling national policy on workload rationalization during the period relevant to the study.

Against this backdrop, examining the nexus between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes in public secondary schools on Alabat Island remains both timely and necessary. Teachers in geographically constrained and staffing limited school systems may still experience difficulties in balancing instruction, ancillary work, and school operational demands even under a rationalized workload framework. By analyzing workload allocation and students' learning outcomes within the still controlling policy environment of DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024, the study seeks to generate evidence-based recommendations that may strengthen workload management, improve instructional support, and contribute to better educational quality in public secondary schools.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to investigate the nexus between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes in the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in public secondary schools of Alabat Island, Division of Quezon.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the workload allocation of teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of:

- 1.1. Teaching load;
- 1.2. Class size;
- 1.3. Teacher ancillary tasks;
- 1.4. Teaching-related assignments;
- 1.5. Non-teaching related assignments?

2. What is the level of students' learning outcomes in terms of academic grades in specialization handled by the teacher-respondents?

3. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes?

4. What are the challenges encountered by the teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of:

- 4.1. Teaching load;
- 4.2. Class size;
- 4.3. Teacher ancillary tasks;
- 4.4. Teaching-related assignments;
- 4.5. Non-teaching related assignments?

5. What are the strategies applied to address the challenges encountered by the teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of:

- 5.1. Teaching load;
- 5.2. Class size;
- 5.3. Teacher ancillary tasks;
- 5.4. Teaching-related assignments;
- 5.5. Non-teaching related assignments?

6. What policy recommendations can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach to provide a comprehensive analysis. Data were gathered through survey questionnaires and document analysis, specifically teachers' workload allocation and students' academic performance records. A correlational research design was used to determine whether a significant relationship exists between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes. This approach helped analyze whether reducing teachers' non-instructional tasks is associated with improved student performance.

Research Population and Sample

Across the eleven (11) public secondary schools on Alabat Island, Division of Quezon, the total teacher population during the conduct of the study was 248. To ensure comprehensive representation of the secondary teaching workforce in the area, all teachers were considered part of the target population. However, only 131 teachers responded to the survey instruments, constituting the actual respondents of the study.

The respondents were public secondary school teachers assigned to various subject areas and grade levels. They were directly involved in classroom instruction and were subject to workload allocation policies under DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024. As classroom teachers, they managed teaching loads, class advisory responsibilities, ancillary tasks, and other teaching-related and non-teaching assignments. Their direct engagement in instructional delivery and school-based responsibilities made them appropriate sources of data for examining workload allocation and its relationship to students' learning outcomes.

These teachers were selected to determine whether DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 was fully implemented among public secondary school teachers on Alabat Island and to assess how the policy was reflected in their actual workload allocation.

District	Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Teachers Responded
Alabat	Alabat Island National High School	110	52
	Angeles Caglate Integrated School	8	5
	C. B. Encarnado Integrated School	6	5
	R. T. Camacho Integrated School	6	5
Perez	Pambuhan Integrated School	4	4
	Perez National High School	42	23

	Severo Tejada Integrated School	7	6
	Cesar C. Tan Memorial National High School	31	15
Quezon	Evaristo R. Macalintal Memorial National High School	15	9
	Joel B. Arquiza National High School	11	5
	Pablo D. Maningas National High School	8	2
Total		248	131

Table 1. Teacher-Respondents

Research Instruments

To ensure a comprehensive and systematic analysis, this study utilized a four-part research instrument designed to gather quantitative and documentary data relevant to the objectives of the research.

Part I focused on teachers' workload allocation. A structured checklist was used to collect data on various components of workload, including teaching load, class size, ancillary assignments, and other teaching-related responsibilities. This section aimed to determine the extent and distribution of teachers assigned tasks.

In measuring the time allocated to teaching-related assignments, the study used minute intervals to estimate the duration of tasks performed by teachers. The use of minute-based reporting is consistent with academic time-use research, which commonly employs structured time segments to capture short and intermittent activities more accurately and to reduce recall error. Many time-use studies adopt intervals such as 20-minute or 30-minute blocks to systematically record teachers' daily tasks. For instance, a Philippine teacher time-use study utilized 20-minute diary intervals across a full day, while other peer-reviewed studies tracked teacher activities using 30-minute segments (Thompson et al., 2024). The use of time intervals in this study therefore allowed for a more accurate estimation of the time devoted to teaching-related assignments.

Part II examined the challenges encountered by teachers in implementing the provisions stipulated in DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024. A Likert-scale questionnaire was employed to measure the level of difficulty experienced by teachers in relation to workload allocation and policy implementation. The items were designed to capture specific operational and administrative concerns affecting instructional efficiency.

Part III explored the strategies employed by teachers in addressing workload-related challenges. A checklist questionnaire was used to identify coping mechanisms and management approaches adopted by teachers to maintain instructional effectiveness despite workload demands.

Part IV involved collecting students' academic performance data. A data retrieval form was utilized to obtain students' grades for the first and second quarters from official school records, subject to approval and authorization from the school administration. This process provided objective and verifiable measures of student learning outcomes.

Prior to full implementation, the research instruments underwent a validation process. Three experts—a school head, a statistician, and a language teacher—reviewed the instruments to ensure clarity, content validity, reliability, and alignment with the study's objectives. After expert validation, pilot testing was conducted among a small group of teachers who were not included in the actual respondents of the study. This procedure assessed the clarity of instructions, internal consistency, and overall reliability of the questionnaires.

School administrators also assisted in evaluating the feasibility and accuracy of the data retrieval process. Feedback gathered from validators and pilot participants was carefully analyzed and incorporated to refine the wording, structure, and content of the instruments. This systematic validation and refinement process strengthened the reliability and credibility of the tools used to examine the relationship between teacher workload allocation and student learning outcomes in public secondary schools on Alabat Island.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data collection process was conducted systematically to ensure the reliability, validity, and ethical integrity of the study. Prior to data collection, the researcher formally sought approval from the Schools Division Office and the respective school heads of the selected public secondary schools on Alabat Island. A letter of request outlining the objectives of the study, research methodology, instruments to be used, and ethical considerations was submitted for review and approval. Upon securing the necessary permissions, coordination meetings were held with school administrators to schedule the distribution of research instruments.

The validated questionnaires were administered to the teacher-respondents during scheduled faculty meetings or designated professional development sessions to ensure maximum participation. Clear instructions regarding the purpose of the study and the proper accomplishment of the instruments were explained before distribution. Respondents were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaires to minimize response bias and ensure thoughtful responses.

To gather data on students' academic performance, a data retrieval form was used to collect first- and second-quarter grades from official school records. This process was conducted with the approval and supervision of the school administration to ensure the accuracy and confidentiality of student information.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the study. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. Respondents were assured that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The confidentiality and anonymity of participants were maintained by coding the questionnaires and restricting access to the collected data. All information gathered was used solely for academic and research purposes.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The collected data underwent systematic processing and analysis to address the study's research questions. Data gathered from the structured questionnaires were encoded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). To determine teachers' workload allocation in Statement of the Problem 1, descriptive statistics were utilized. Frequency counts and percentages were computed to present how often specific workload elements—such as teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments—occurred among the respondents. In addition, the mean and standard deviation were calculated to determine the average level of workload allocation and to measure the variability or consistency of teachers' workload across the sample.

To assess students' learning outcomes in Statement of the Problem 2, their academic grades in the learning areas handled by teacher-respondent for the first and second quarters were collected and analyzed. These grades served as indicators of academic performance and provided insights into how students progressed in their studies. By examining these grading periods, the study identified trends, variations, and potential factors influencing student achievement.

To analyze students' academic performance, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were employed. The mean determined the overall level of student performance, while the standard deviation measured the variability of grades. These statistical tools provided a clearer understanding of the distribution and consistency of students' learning outcomes. For interpretation, the following grading scale was applied:

Numerical Rating	Description	Qualitative Descriptions
90 - 100 %	Outstanding	The students' outstanding learning outcomes equivalent to 81% to 100%.
85 - 89 %	Very Satisfactory	The students' very satisfactory learning outcomes equivalent to 61% to 80%.
80 - 84 %	Satisfactory	The students' satisfactory learning outcomes equivalent to 41% to 60%.
75 - 79 %	Fairly Satisfactory	The students' fairly satisfactory learning outcomes equivalent to 21% to 40%.
Below 75%	Did not Meet Expectations	The students' learning outcomes did not meet expectations equivalent to 0% to 20%.

Table 2. Scale of Students' Learning Outcomes

To examine the relationship between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes in Statement of the Problem 3, correlational analysis was conducted using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r). This statistical test determined whether a significant relationship existed between teachers' workload allocation and students' academic performance based on their first and second quarter grades.

To identify the challenges encountered by teachers in Statement of the Problem 4, descriptive statistics—specifically mean and standard deviation—were used. In assessing the challenges encountered in the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, a rating scale was applied. Teachers indicated the extent to which they experienced specific challenges using the following scale:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Descriptions
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Encountered	The challenges very highly encountered by teachers equivalent to 81% to 100%.
4	3.40 – 4.19	Highly Encountered	The challenges highly encountered by teachers equivalent to 61% to 80%.
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Encountered	The challenges moderately encountered by teachers equivalent to 41% to 60%.
2	1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Encountered	The challenges by teachers with slightly encountered equivalent to 21% to 40%.
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Encountered	Not a challenge for teachers equivalent to 0% to 20%.

Table 3. Scale of Challenges Encountered by Teachers

By utilizing a purely quantitative research approach, this study provided a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between teacher workload allocation and student learning outcomes in public secondary schools on Alabat Island, with students' first and second quarter grades serving as key academic performance indicators.

Ethical Consideration

The study adhered to ethical standards to protect the rights, dignity, and privacy of all respondents. Approval was secured from the Schools Division Office and relevant authorities prior to data collection.

Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents, who were also informed of their right to withdraw at any time. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured through coding of responses and secure data handling, with access limited to the researcher.

The study avoided any form of harm or coercion, and all data were used solely for academic purposes. It complied with the ethical guidelines of the Department of Education and upheld academic integrity throughout the research process.

Results and Discussion

Part I discusses the workload allocation of teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, specifically in terms of teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments. Part II describes the level of students' learning outcomes, as reflected in their academic grades in the teachers' respective areas of specialization. Moreover, Part III examines the significant relationship between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes. Subsequently, Part IV presents the challenges encountered by teachers in implementing the policy, categorized into teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments.

In connection with these challenges, Part V outlines the strategies teachers use to address them, likewise discussing teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments.

Finally, Part VI synthesizes the study's findings to inform the proposed recommendations, outlining implications for policy implementation and educational practice.

Part I. Workload Allocation of Teachers During the Implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024

This section presents the findings on teachers' workload allocation during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024. This section presents how teachers' responsibilities are distributed across key workload components: teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching related assignments.

This study examined how instructional duties and additional responsibilities are allocated among teachers under the policy.

This discussion underpins a clear understanding of teachers' overall workload, which is further elaborated in the subsequent analyses and tables.

Teaching load

Table 4 presents data for the workload allocation of teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of teaching load.

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching Load		
Less than 30 hours	68	51.9
30 hours	38	29.0
More than 30 hours	25	19.1
Total	131	100.0

Table 4. Distribution of Responses on Teaching Load

Table 4 shows that majority of teaching loads were less than 30 hours, with 68 teachers or 51.9% of the respondents falling into this group. This was followed by 38 teachers or 29% who carried exactly 30 hours, while 25 teachers or 19.1 percent reported loads beyond 30 hours. This pattern suggests that a regulated or lighter load was already experienced by most teachers, although a noticeable share still handled heavier teaching demands.

In view thereof, the distribution implies that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 has started to move teacher workload toward the intended direction of a more manageable assignment of duties. Since most teachers were below or at the expected range, the policy appears to be helping schools limit excessive classroom hours and organize teaching responsibilities more carefully.

This result is important to students' learning outcomes because teacher workload shapes the time and energy teachers can devote to lesson preparation, assessment, feedback, remediation, and learner support. When teaching loads are manageable, teachers are in a better position to focus on the quality of instruction and to respond to students' academic needs more consistently. For this reason, the observed pattern is significant, as it suggests that sustaining the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 can help create conditions that are more favorable for improved student learning in public secondary schools.

This policy direction is supported by empirical evidence showing that excessive workload and work intensification weaken teacher wellbeing and reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023), while a systematic review found evidence that teacher burnout is associated with lower academic achievement and less favorable student reported outcomes (Madigan & Kim, 2021). Related evidence also indicates that workload is linked to important dimensions of teaching quality, such as classroom management, clarity of instruction, cognitive activation, and student teacher relationships, which are all central to students' learning outcomes (Ouwehand et al., 2022). In the same way, qualitative findings from high school settings showed that excessive teacher workload delays syllabus completion and negatively affects learners' academic excellence and metacognition (Joe & Mtsi, 2024).

Class Size

Table 5 presents the data for the workload allocation of teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of class size.

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Class Size		
15 students and below	4	3.1
16 – 25 students	21	16.0
26 – 35 students	20	15.3
36 – 45 students	83	63.4
46 students and above	3	2.3
Total	131	100.0

Table 5. Distribution of Responses on Class Size

As shown in Table 5, the largest group of teachers handled classes with 36 to 45 students, with 83 respondents or 63.4 % of the total. Much smaller groups were assigned to classes with 16 to 25 students, with 21 respondents or 16.0%, and 26 to 35 students, with 20 respondents or 15.3%. Only a few teachers reported very small classes of 15 students or fewer, with 4 respondents or 3.1%, and very large classes of 46 students or more, with 3 respondents or 2.3%. These figures show that the dominant classroom condition during the implementation period was a relatively within the standard class size concentrated within the 36 to 45 learner range.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, the result suggests that workload rationalization should not be viewed only through teaching hours but also through the number of learners assigned to each class. DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2006 provides a useful point of comparison because it sets the ideal class size from 15 to 65 learners and the ideal average at 50 learners per class, which means that the class sizes reported in this study generally remain within the official class organization standard.

In this sense, the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 may be considered aligned with policy in terms of regulating workload. The result is important to students' learning outcomes because class size influences the amount of teacher attention, the quality of classroom interaction, and the level of support students receive in daily instruction. Evidence shows that smaller classes allow students to receive more individual attention from teachers and more active teacher student interaction, while classroom engagement tends to decrease in larger classes, especially among lower attaining students at the secondary level (Blatchford et al., 2011). In the same way, international studies found that smaller classes produce at least a small positive effect on reading achievement, showing that class size remains relevant to academic performance (Filges et al., 2018).

This concern becomes more meaningful in the context of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 because the policy aims to create a more manageable workload and a better teaching environment. Related evidence further shows that heavy workload and work intensification reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023). Moreover, analysis of 21,903 schools across 80 countries identified a class size benchmark of 27, beyond which learning related outcomes became more unpredictable, suggesting that class size can shape the stability and quality of students' school experience (Antoniou et al., 2024).

Thus, dominant in the reported class sizes still fall within the formal standard of DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2006. Its practical effect on instruction matters, especially when the purpose of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 is to improve both teacher work conditions and student learning outcomes.

Teacher Ancillary Tasks

The succeeding discussion focuses on teachers' ancillary tasks during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, as reflected in the findings presented in Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9. In this section, the indicators are expressed in number of minutes in order to capture the actual time teachers spend performing ancillary tasks. The use of minute intervals is supported by the study of Thompson et al. (2024), which explained that many academic time-use studies utilize minute-based intervals

(e.g., 20-minute or 30-minute blocks) because this approach reduces recall error and captures short-duration tasks more accurately.

This section also presents how teachers' time is distributed across activities that support instruction but are not part of direct classroom teaching. These activities include curriculum planning, curriculum delivery and pedagogy, assessment of learners' progress, and homeroom guidance and management. The data provide a basis for understanding the extent to which these responsibilities form part of teachers' daily workload.

	Frequency	Percentage
CURRICULUM PLANNING		
Preparation of Lesson Plans (per week)		
30 mins and below	6	4.6
31 – 60 mins	21	16.0
61 – 90 mins	38	29.0
91 – 120 mins	25	19.1
121 mins and above	11	8.4
Total	131	100.0
Action Research (per month)		
Not Engaged	90	68.7
60 mins and below	22	16.8
61 – 120 mins	15	11.5
121 – 180 mins	0	0.00
181 – 240 mins	2	1.5
241 mins and above	2	1.5
Total	131	100.0
Attendance to Learning Action Cell (per month)		
60 mins and below	34	26.0
61 – 120 mins	60	45.8
121 – 180 mins	18	13.7
181 – 240 mins	4	3.1
241 mins and above	15	11.5
Total	131	100.0

Table 6. Distribution of Responses on Ancillary Tasks in Curriculum Planning

As shown in Table 6, the most dominant time demands among ancillary tasks related to curriculum and pedagogy were lesson planning. The largest number of teachers spent 61 to 90 minutes per week on lesson planning, with 38 respondents or 29.0%, followed by 91 to 120 minutes per week, with 25 respondents or 19.1%. In the same way, most teachers spent 61 to 120 minutes attending LAC sessions per month or 30 minutes per week, with 60 respondents or 45.8 percent, while 34 respondents or 26.0% spent 60 minutes or less. By contrast, action research drew the least time, as 90 teachers or 68.7 percent reported no engagement in it per month.

Based on the upper limit of the dominant weekly ranges, lesson planning may account for as much as 90 minutes per week and LAC participation for as much as 15 minutes per week. This yields a combined 105 minutes, or 1.75 hours per week, which is equivalent to about 21 minutes per day across a five-day school week which is within the allotted time set in DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because the quality of lesson planning and the strength of teacher collaboration shape the quality of instruction that students experience in class. DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 and its implementation guidelines protect time for ancillary tasks precisely because these duties are considered part of the work that supports learner development and effective instruction (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b).

Related work on lesson study among secondary school teachers also showed that collaborative planning and reflection improved lesson quality, teacher competence, and student related outcomes (Bautista & Baniqued, 2021). For this reason, the computed 105 minutes per week for lesson planning and LAC participation should not be seen only as added workload.

It is also a meaningful investment in curriculum planning that can strengthen students' learning outcomes when the time required remains manageable within the broader implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

	Frequency	Percentage
CURRICULUM DELIVERY AND PEDAGOGY		
Preparation of instructional aids and materials (per week)		
30 mins and below	5	3.8
31 – 60 mins	32	24.4
61 – 90 mins	39	29.8
91 – 120 mins	26	19.8
121 mins and above	29	22.1
Total	131	100.0
Checking and recording learners' attendance (per week)		
30 mins and below	21	16.0
31 – 60 mins	36	27.5
61 – 90 mins	29	22.1
91 – 120 mins	16	12.2
121 mins and above	29	22.1
Total	131	100.0

Table 7. Distribution of Responses on Tasks in Curriculum Delivery and Pedagogy

Table 7 indicates that a considerable share of teachers' non-classroom time was devoted to curriculum delivery and pedagogy. The preparation of instructional aids and materials emerged as the more demanding task, since the largest group of teachers (39 or 29.8%) reported spending 61 to 90 minutes, while 29 or 22.1% spent 121 minutes or more. Checking and recording learners' attendance also required ample time, with many 36 or 27.5% of teachers clustering in the 31 to 60 minutes, alongside with both 29 or 22.1% of teachers reported to spend both 61 to 90 and 121 minutes or more.

Based on the dominant ranges, the maximum count may be estimated at 90 minutes per week for the preparation of instructional aids and materials and 60 minutes per week for checking and recording learners' attendance. This gives a total of 150 minutes, or 2.5 hours per week, which is equivalent to about 30 minutes per day across a five-day school week which is within the allotted time per day for non-classroom works.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, the dominant result suggests that the computed 150 minutes or 2.5 hours per week spent on preparation of instructional materials and attendance recording suggests that a meaningful share of teachers' ancillary time is concentrated on curriculum delivery and pedagogy. This amount of time remains within the daily allowance provided by the policy.

This finding is important to students' learning outcomes because the quality of instructional materials and the consistency of attendance monitoring influence both instruction and student participation in school. Research shows that teaching materials contribute to instructional design and teacher development, and that teachers' ability to choose and adapt them is linked to stronger instructional effectiveness and classroom confidence, which are central to good classroom learning (Abad & Hattie, 2025). Research also notes that high quality instructional materials function as a lever for improving classroom instruction and student achievement when teachers are able to use them well in relation to learner needs and context (Marek et al., 2025). In the same way, attendance is not merely a routine clerical concern, because regular school participation is positively associated with achievement, and teacher related factors can influence student absences over time, making attendance monitoring part of the broader learning process (Gershenson, 2016). At the same time, the educational value of these tasks depends on whether they remain manageable, since a systematic synthesis of research found that heavy workload and work intensification reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023).

For this reason, the computed 150 minutes per week devoted to preparation of instructional materials and attendance checking should not be viewed only as added workload. It is also a necessary instructional investment that can strengthen students' learning outcomes when it supports effective teaching and consistent participation when these routine duties consume too much of teachers' available time within the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024

	Frequency	Percentage
ASSESSMENT OF LEARNER'S PROGRESS		
Checking of exercises and summative tests (per week)		
30 mins and below	68	51.9
31 – 60 mins	38	29.0
61 – 90 mins	0	0.00
91 – 120 mins	0	0.00
121 mins and above	25	19.1
Total	131	100.0
Recording of academic performance results (per week)		
30 mins and below	4	3.1
31 – 60 mins	21	16.0
61 – 90 mins	20	15.3
91 – 120 mins	83	63.4
121 mins and above	3	2.3
Total	131	100.0
Grading learners' performance or achievement (per week)		
30 mins and below	6	4.6
31 – 60 mins	51	38.9
61 – 90 mins	38	29.0
91 – 120 mins	25	19.1
121 mins and above	11	8.4
Total	131	100.0

Table 8. Distribution of Responses on Ancillary Tasks in Assessment of Learner's Progress

Table As presented in Table 8, the most dominant time demands under assessment of learner's progress were recording academic performance results and grading learners' performance. Most teachers spent 91 to 120 minutes recording academic performance results, with 83 respondents or 63.4%. In addition, most teachers also spent 31 to 60 minutes grading learners' performance, with 38.9%, while another 29.0% spent 61 to 90 minutes. In contrast, checking exercises and summative tests was generally completed within shorter periods, since 68 teachers or 51.9% spent 30 minutes or less and 38 teachers or 29.0% spent 31 to 60 minutes, although 25 teachers or 19.1% still reported 121 minutes or more.

Based on the dominant ranges, the maximum count may be set at 30 minutes per week for checking exercises and summative tests, 60 minutes per week for grading learners' performance or achievement, and 120 minutes per week for recording academic performance results. This gives a total of 210 minutes, or 3.5 hours per week, which is equivalent to about 42 minutes per day across a five-day school week which is also within the allotted time for non-classroom works of teachers.

In this light, the computed 210 minutes or 3.5 hours per week spent on checking, grading, and recording suggests that a large share of teachers' ancillary time is concentrated on assessment of learner's progress and remains within the two-hour daily limit allowed by the order. This means that DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 appears to have protected time for essential assessment duties.

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because checking, grading, and recording are not merely clerical tasks. DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 and its implementation guidelines support this view by protecting time for ancillary work that directly supports teaching and learner development, including assessment related tasks that inform classroom decisions (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b).

It was analyzed that high quality and action-oriented teacher feedback improves student achievement, motivation, and engagement, which means that the time teachers devote to checking and grading can strengthen learning when it results in usable feedback for students (Brandmo & Gamlem, 2025). Research on marking and feedback has also shown that reducing excessive marking workload can lessen teachers' working hours while preserving teachers' positive views about pupils' learning outcomes, suggesting that assessment work supports learning best when it remains manageable (Morris et al.,

2024). In addition, a systematic research synthesis found that heavy workload and work intensification reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that support student learning, which means that even necessary assessment work may weaken classroom effectiveness when it becomes too time intensive (Creagh et al., 2023).

For this reason, the computed 210 minutes per week devoted to assessment of learner's progress is significant in the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 because it can strengthen students' learning outcomes through better feedback and closer monitoring of progress.

	Frequency	Percentage
HOMEROOM GUIDANCE AND MANAGEMENT		
Class Advising Duties (per week)		
30 mins and below	90	68.7
31 – 60 mins	22	16.8
61 – 90 mins	15	11.5
91 – 120 mins	0	0.00
121 mins and above	4	3.1
Total	131	100.0
Periodic Reporting of Attendance (per quarter)		
60 mins and below	34	26.0
61 – 120 mins	60	45.8
121 – 180 mins	18	13.7
181 – 240 mins	4	3.1
241 mins and above	15	11.5
Total	131	100.0
Preparation and submission of report card and other school forms (per quarter)		
60 mins and below	5	3.8
61 – 120 mins	32	24.4
121 – 180 mins	39	29.8
181 – 240 mins	26	19.8
241 mins and above	29	22.1
Total	131	100.0
Conference with parents and home visits when necessary (per quarter)		
60 mins and below	21	16.0
61 – 120 mins	36	27.5
121 – 180 mins	29	22.1
181 – 240 mins	16	12.2
241 mins and above	29	22.1
Total	131	100.0

Table 9. Distribution of Responses on Ancillary Tasks in Homeroom Guidance and Management

Table 9 shows the homeroom guidance and management of teachers. Most teachers spent 30 minutes or less per week on class advising duties, with 90 respondents or 68.7%, which suggests that this task was usually handled within shorter periods. However, periodic reporting of attendance required more time, as 60 teachers or 45.8% spent 61 to 120 minutes per quarter or 30 minutes per week on it. The preparation and submission of report cards and other school forms have teachers clustered in 121 to 180 minutes per quarter or 45 minutes per week at 29.8% and 241 minutes or more per quarter at 22.1%. Conferences with parents and home visits also required considerable time, especially within the 61 to 120 minutes per quarter or 30 minutes per week range at 27.5% and the 121 to 180 minutes per quarter or 45 minutes per week range at 22.1%.

Based on the dominant weekly ranges, the maximum count may be estimated at 90 minutes for class advising duties, 120 minutes for periodic reporting of attendance per quarter, 180 minutes for preparation and submission of report cards and other school forms per quarter, and 120 minutes for conferences with parents and home visits when necessary per quarter. This yields a total of 135 minutes per week, or 2.25 hours per week, which is equivalent to about 27 minutes per day across a five-day school week which is within the allotted time for ancillary tasks of teachers.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, the dominant result suggests that implementation is keeping teachers' ancillary work directed toward learner support, school communication, and required documentation. In this light, the computed 135 minutes or 2.25 hours per week devoted to homeroom guidance and management suggests that teachers' ancillary time is concentrated in advising, attendance reporting, school forms, and communication with families. This implies that DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 has indeed protected time for essential learner focused and school-based support functions. The result therefore suggests that the order is aligning teachers' non-classroom duties with the teaching and learning process.

This dominant result is important to students' learning outcomes because homeroom guidance and management connect school attendance, family engagement, academic reporting, and teacher support into one continuous process that can influence student progress. Research shows that school attendance is deeply linked to academic functioning, and absenteeism serves as an early warning signal for wider academic, social, and emotional difficulties, which means that attendance reporting is not simply clerical work but part of supporting student success (Kearney et al., 2023). Sustained parental participation in parent teacher conferences has also been associated with better performance in high school and college entrance examinations, which suggests that teacher time spent communicating with families can contribute to stronger academic outcomes over time (Fu et al., 2025). In the same way, a systematic review and meta synthesis found that parent teacher conferences are central to home school collaboration and to the development of teachers' communicative competence, while broader evidence on parental engagement shows positive links with children's educational performance, motivation, and behaviour (Munthe & Westergård, 2023; Monfrance et al., 2025). Yet the benefit of these tasks depends on whether they remain manageable, because a systematic research synthesis found that heavy workload and work intensification reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023). For this reason, the computed 510 minutes per week devoted to homeroom guidance and management is significant in the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 because it can strengthen students' learning outcomes through closer monitoring, stronger family communication, and more consistent learner support, but it may also limit those outcomes when these duties take too much of teachers' available time.

In general, based on the weekly equivalents reported in Tables 6 to 9, teachers spend an estimated 600 minutes or 10 hours per week on ancillary tasks, broken down into 1.75 hours for curriculum planning, 2.5 hours for curriculum delivery and pedagogy, 3.5 hours for assessment of learner's progress, and 2.25 hours for homeroom guidance and management. This is equal to 120 minutes or 2 hours per day across a five-day school week.

In relation to DO No. 05, s. 2024, this total is highly significant because the policy allows teachers to render six hours of actual classroom teaching and two hours for work incidental to normal teaching duties each day, while the implementation guidelines retain this two hour daily structure for ancillary work and permit simplified tracking of these duties within or outside the school premises (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b).

Thus, the general result suggests that the estimated ancillary workload is aligned with the full policy ceiling, not below it. This indicates compliance with the letter of the policy, yet it also shows that teachers are already operating at the maximum allowable weekly limit for non-classroom work. Research on teacher workload warns that when work demands sit at or near the upper boundary for sustained periods, they may still generate time pressure, work intensification, and reduced professional capacity, even when they technically remain policy compliant (Creagh et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2025).

This pattern matters for student learning outcomes because the 10 hours are not spent on peripheral duties alone. They are concentrated in tasks that directly shape teaching quality, learner monitoring, school participation, and home school partnership. Evidence shows that collaborative planning and reflective work improve lesson quality, teacher competence, and student related outcomes, while better quality teacher collaboration is associated with gains in mathematics and reading achievement (Bautista & Baniqued, 2021; Ronfeldt et al., 2015).

Instructional materials also support stronger instructional design and teacher development, and high-quality teacher feedback improves student achievement, motivation, and engagement (Abad & Hattie, 2025; Brandmo & Gamlem, 2025). At the same time, attendance reporting and family communication matter because absenteeism is an early warning signal for wider academic difficulty, and sustained parental participation in parent teacher conferences is associated with stronger examination performance (Kearney et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2025).

In this sense, the general result supports the intent of DepEd Order No. 05, s. 2024, since the ancillary hours are being used for educationally relevant work.

Teaching-Related Assignments

This section presents the findings on teachers' teaching-related assignments during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, as presented in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

This discussion focuses on the additional roles assigned to teachers beyond their regular classroom instruction. It outlines how teaching-related responsibilities are categorized into specialized coordinatorship roles, trainer/adviser functions, and leadership roles through chairmanship.

The data presents the distribution of coordinator assignments, including literacy, research, inclusive education, ICT, and guidance-related roles, as well as teaching-related tasks under co-curricular and student development activities. It also presents the leadership responsibilities given to teachers at the grade and learning area levels.

The succeeding discussion provides a clearer understanding of how these teaching-related assignments are allocated among teachers, allowing readers to examine the extent to which additional instructional and leadership roles form part of teachers' overall workload under the policy.

Table 10 presents the workload allocation of teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of teaching-related assignments related to school coordinatorship.

	Frequency	Percentage
TEACHING-RELATED ASSIGNMENTS		
School Coordinatorship		
Reading/ Literacy and Numeracy		
Assigned	28	21.4
Not Assigned	103	78.6
Total	131	100.0
Research		
Assigned	4	3.1
Not Assigned	127	96.9
Total	131	100.0
Special Needs Education (SNED)		
Assigned	1	0.8
Not Assigned	130	99.2
Total	131	100.0
Information, Communication, and Technology		
Assigned	17	13.0
Not Assigned	114	87.0
Total	131	100.0
Guidance and Advocacy		
Assigned	17	13.0
Not Assigned	114	87.0
Total	131	100.0
Inclusive Education (as may be applicable)		
Assigned	1	0.8
Not Assigned	130	99.2
Total	131	100.0

Table 10. Distribution of Responses on Teaching-Related Assignments in School Coordinatorship

As presented in Table 10, only a small group of teachers carried teaching related assignments beyond their regular classroom roles. The most common additional assignment was in Reading, Literacy, and Numeracy, where 21.4% of teachers served as coordinators, while 78.6% were not assigned to this role. Information and Communication Technology and Guidance and Advocacy were each reported by 13.0% of teachers, which also means that most respondents did not

assume these functions. Participation in research related assignments was very limited at 3.1%, while Special Needs Education and Inclusive Education were each reported by only 0.8 % of teachers.

This distribution shows that specialized assignments were distributed in a small number of teachers, while the larger number of respondents remained focused on their primary instructional work.

In relation to the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, this dominant pattern suggests that teaching related assignments were being distributed in a selective and controlled manner. The policy provides that teachers render eight hours of service per day, with six hours for actual classroom teaching and two hours for incidental duties that support the teaching and learning process, while the implementation guidelines direct school heads to ensure fair and equitable distribution of teaching load and to assign teaching related work proportionate to available time, especially for teachers with less than six hours of actual teaching (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b).

In this light, the fact that most teachers were not assigned coordinatorship or specialized support roles may be read as a sign that the policy was helping protect the majority of teachers from role expansion beyond their core instructional function. This matters because research has shown that when teachers' roles expand and intensify, the consequences often include strain on pedagogy, relationships with students, and professional well-being (Valli & Buese, 2007; Creagh et al., 2023). The result therefore implies that the implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024 was not simply about limiting hours, but also about limiting the spread of additional roles so that classroom teaching remained the central work of most teachers.

This findings proves that protecting teachers from excessive additional assignments can preserve their attention for lesson delivery, assessment, and learner support. Evidence indicates that heavy workload and work intensification reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023). Earlier evidence likewise showed that the expansion and intensification of teachers' roles can negatively affect pedagogy and classroom relationships, both of which are central to student learning (Valli & Buese, 2007). At the same time, some specialized assignments clearly require focused expertise. Reviews on ICT in inclusive and special education show that these functions demand specific technological and pedagogical competence and that effective implementation depends on adequate support and trained personnel rather than broad assignment to all teachers (Bosse et al., 2024; López et al., 2025). In the same way, coordinatorship research has pointed out that heavier coordinatorship workload calls for balanced distribution, support systems, and regular workload assessment to protect teacher effectiveness (Merdegia et al., 2024).

For this reason, the selective allocation observed in Table 10 may be viewed as beneficial to students' learning outcomes because it appears to keep most teachers focused on core teaching responsibilities, while reserving specialized functions for a smaller group who can more feasibly handle them.

	Frequency	Percentage
TEACHING-RELATED ASSIGNMENTS		
Trainer/ Adviser		
School Paper		
Assigned	19	14.5
Not Assigned	112	85.5
Total	131	100.0
Sports Development Programs		
Assigned	22	16.8
Not Assigned	109	83.2
Total	131	100.0
Supreme Secondary Learner Government (SSLG)		
Assigned	9	6.9
Not Assigned	122	93.1
Total	131	100.0

Table 11. Distribution of Respondents on Teaching-Related Assignments in Trainer/ Adviser

As shown in Table 11, few teachers carried teaching related assignments under the role of trainer or adviser. The largest of these was sports development at 16.8%, followed by school paper at 14.5%, while Guidance and Advocacy did not appear

in this table and student leadership development through SSLG advisership was reported by only 6.9%. The same pattern of limited participation was seen in other specialized support functions, where the overwhelming majority of respondents were not assigned to these roles.

This distribution suggests that most teachers remained centered on their regular classroom work, while training, coaching, and student leadership tasks were confined to a smaller group of selected teachers.

Viewed in relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, only a minority of teachers were assigned roles in school paper, sports development, or SSLG advisership suggests that the policy was functioning not only as a limit on hours, but also as a control on role expansion. This matters because research has shown that when teachers' roles multiply beyond classroom instruction, work intensifies and professional strain increases, often affecting pedagogy and teacher wellbeing (Creagh et al., 2023; Valli & Buese, 2007). The finding therefore implies that the implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024 was helping prevent the widespread distribution of extra roles and allowing most teachers to concentrate on core teaching responsibilities.

This results imply that DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 and its implementation guidelines protect teachers' classroom time while allowing only proportionate teaching related assignments that support learning and student development (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). Empirical studies also show that extracurricular participation in journalism, sports, and leadership activities is associated with educational benefits, though the effects are often small and depend on how such activities are structured and supported. A meta analysis found that journalism, sports, and leadership activities showed generally small positive associations with educational outcomes in secondary schools (Shulruf, 2010). Research on school based physical activity likewise reported that sports participation and related programs can support concentration, classroom behavior, and academic performance when implemented well (Trudeau & Shephard, 2008). Even so, workload research consistently warns that adding responsibilities beyond teaching can reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that directly support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023).

In conclusion, the selective allocation seen in Table 11 may be understood as beneficial to student learning outcomes, because it allows a few teachers to handle cocurricular development while helping the larger teaching force preserve time and energy for instruction, assessment, and learner support.

	Frequency	Percentage
TEACHING-RELATED ASSIGNMENTS		
Chairmanship		
Grade Level		
Assigned	18	13.7
Not Assigned	113	86.3
Total	131	100.0
Learning Area		
Assigned	45	34.4
Not Assigned	86	65.6
Total	131	100.0

Table 12. Distribution of Responses on Teaching-Related Assignments in Chairmanship

Based on Table 12, only a few teachers carried formal leadership assignments through chairmanship. Grade level chairmanship was reported by 18 teachers or 13.7%, while 86.3% did not hold this role. Learning area chairmanship was more common, with 45 teachers or 34.4% serving in this capacity, although the larger share, 65.6%, still remained unassigned. This pattern shows that additional leadership roles were not widely spread across the teaching force. Instead, they were entrusted in a limited group of teachers, with learning area leadership emerging as the more visible assignment during implementation.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, the result suggests that the policy was generally able to limit the broad distribution of added leadership responsibilities. The limited assignment of grade level chairmanship and the more selective allocation of learning area chairmanship indicate that the implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024 was protecting most teachers from role expansion beyond their primary teaching function. This matters because research has shown that role expansion and work

intensification can increase strain and affect teachers' effectiveness and professional well-being (Creagh et al., 2023; Valli & Buese, 2007).

This result is important to students' learning outcomes because leadership roles in schools can support instructional coordination. Evidence indicates that school leadership and teacher leadership are associated with improved student outcomes when they strengthen instructional capacity, school climate, and coordination of teaching (Bush, 2024; Ozdogru et al., 2025). At the same time, workload research consistently shows that excessive additional duties reduce teachers' capacity to carry out educational priorities that directly support learning (Creagh et al., 2023). Research on coordinatorship workload likewise emphasizes the need for balanced workload distribution, recognition, and regular workload assessment to preserve teacher effectiveness (Merdegia et al., 2024).

Results in Table 12 may be viewed as educationally important. Limiting chairmanship to a smaller group may help most teachers maintain focus on instruction, while the presence of a sizable group of learning area chairs may still provide the coordination needed for subject based improvement. In this way, the selective allocation of leadership roles under DO No. 5, s. 2024 can support students' learning outcomes when it keeps leadership functions purposeful and manageable rather than broadly added to the workload of all teachers.

Non-teaching-related assignments

Finally, Table 13 presents the workload allocation of teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 in terms of non-teaching responsibilities.

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Non-teaching-related assignments		
No Non-Teaching-related Assignments	89	67.9
GAD Coordinator	1	0.8
LIS Coordinator	1	0.8
YES-O Coordinator	3	2.3
SMEPA Member	1	0.8
LRC Coordinator	1	0.8
Nutrition Month Coordinator	1	0.8
YECS Adviser	1	0.8
School Sports Coordinator	1	0.8
BKD Adviser	2	1.5
Adolescent Reproductive Health Coordinator	1	0.8
Drum and Lyre Band Coordinator	1	0.8
SHS Coordinator	1	0.8
FB Page Coordinator	1	0.8
BAC Chairperson	1	0.8
ALS Coordinator	1	0.8
RCYC Coordinator	1	0.8
SDRRM Coordinator	1	0.8
Designate SHS Adviser	1	0.8
SBM Coordinator	1	0.8
BSP Coordinator	1	0.8
Cultural Coordinator	1	0.8
Health/SHS Coordinator	1	0.8
Eco-Friendly Coordinator/Lyre Band Adviser	1	0.8
GAD/YECS Coordinator	1	0.8
Cultural/YES-O Coordinator	1	0.8
SDRRM/Gulayan sa Paaralan	1	0.8
WINS/Gulayan sa Paaralan Coordinator	1	0.8
BKD Adviser/Bids and Awards Committee	1	0.8
RCYC Adviser/School Information Coordinator	1	0.8
YECS Adviser/SGC Member	1	0.8

ARH/LIS/BEIS Coordinator	1	0.8
BKD Coordinator/YECS Adviser	1	0.8
BAC Chairman/SGC Co-chair	1	0.8
YECS Adviser/SHS Guidance Teacher	1	0.8
SBM/GAD/AIP/SIP Coordinator	1	0.8
School Health/Red Cross Coordinator	1	0.8
BEIS/4P's Coordinator	1	0.8
RCYC Adviser/Aral Focal Person	1	0.8
Gulayan sa Paaralan/SHS Coordinator/Canteen Manager	1	0.8
Total	131	100.0

Table 13. Distribution of Responses in Non-Teaching Related Assignments

Table 13 shows that the majority of teachers were not assigned additional non-teaching roles. A total of 89 teachers (67.9%) reported having no non-teaching related assignments, indicating that most teachers were able to focus primarily on their instructional responsibilities. Only a small number of teachers were assigned to specific coordinatorship and advisory roles, such as YES-O Coordinator (2.3%), BKD Adviser (1.5%), and various other positions, including coordinators for GAD, LIS, health, sports, cultural activities, and student services, each accounting for less than 1.0% of the respondents. This distribution suggests that non-teaching assignments were highly dispersed and handled by selected individuals rather than widely shared among teachers.

Findings indicate that during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. In 2024, efforts were evident to limit the number of non-teaching related assignments for most teachers, which may help reduce workload burden and support greater focus on teaching-related tasks.

To sum it up, findings highlight the overall pattern of teachers' workload during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

In general, the policy contributed to a more regulated distribution of teaching responsibilities, allowing many teachers to focus primarily on classroom instruction. Research shows that when education systems clearly regulate and distribute teachers' responsibilities, teachers are better able to focus on classroom teaching. Studies show that heavy administrative and extra duties often take time away from instruction, but policies that organize and limit non-teaching tasks help protect teachers' core work: teaching students (Creagh et al., 2023). Clear policies that define roles and responsibilities also reduce confusion and role overload, allowing teachers to concentrate on lesson delivery and student learning (Siddiqui & Ahamed, 2020). Recent research further emphasizes that policy driven workload regulation is necessary to prevent instructional time from being "crowded out" by other demands, supporting the idea that structured policies like DO 05, s. 2024 help teachers prioritize classroom instruction (Gavin & McGrath Champ, 2024).

However, large class sizes continued to shape daily teaching conditions, indicating that instructional demands remained substantial despite adjustments in teaching load. Empirical evidence also indicates that as class size increases beyond optimal thresholds, teachers experience higher cognitive and instructional strain, making it harder to provide individualized instruction and maintain effective learning conditions (Antoniou et al., 2024). This finding confirms that even with workload adjustments, large class sizes continue to place substantial instructional demands on teachers, shaping everyday teaching conditions.

Beyond direct teaching, teachers were still required to devote significant time to ancillary tasks that support learning, particularly in lesson preparation, assessment, documentation, and homeroom management. These responsibilities formed an essential but time-consuming part of teachers' professional duties. Studies emphasize that teacher workload should be understood not only by the number of classes taught but also by the density of non-teaching duties, which makes daily work more complex and demanding (Longmuir & McKay, 2024), and that these tasks are essential for effective teaching and student monitoring, but they require substantial time and effort and often extend beyond official teaching hours (Creagh et al., 2023).

Moreover, teaching-related assignments such as coordinatorship, training, advising, and leadership roles were assigned to a limited number of teachers, resulting in a concentration of additional responsibilities among selected individuals. Research highlights that clustering leadership and coordination duties increases the density of work for certain teachers,

even when their teaching load remains the same, making their daily responsibilities more demanding (Longmuir & McKay, 2024).

Most teachers were also not assigned non-teaching related tasks, which helped reduce competing demands and allowed greater focus on instruction. Studies explain that removing administrative and extra role duties protects teachers' core work and prevents instructional time from being reduced by unrelated responsibilities (Creagh et al., 2023). Other research further notes that policies and school practices that limit non-teaching assignments help teachers maintain focus on lesson delivery, student engagement, and learning outcomes, rather than dividing attention across multiple roles (Gavin & McGrath Champ, 2024).

In conclusion, while the policy showed progress in managing instructional load and limiting additional assignments, the persistence of large classes and time-intensive ancillary duties underscores the need for continued support and refinement of workload implementation to ensure sustainable and effective teaching conditions.

Part II. The Level of Students' Learning Outcomes in Terms of Academic Grades in the Area of Specialization Handled by the Teacher-Respondents

This section presents results on students' learning outcomes, measured by academic grades, in the specialization areas handled by the teacher-respondents.

Academic grades are used as an indicator of how well students have achieved the expected learning competencies in their respective specialization subjects.

Examining students' performance in this area provides insight into the effectiveness of instruction and the overall quality of teaching practices implemented by the teacher-respondents.

The discussion that follows describes the general level of students' academic performance and interprets what these outcomes suggest about learning achievement within the specialization areas.

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Level of Performance		
Fairly Satisfactory	1	0.8
Satisfactory	35	26.7
Very Satisfactory	68	51.9
Outstanding	27	20.6
Total	131	100.0
Mean	87.05	
Standard Deviation	3.602	
Verbal Description	Very Satisfactory	

Table 14. Level of Students' Learning Outcomes in Terms of Academic Grades in the Area of Specialization Handled by the Teacher Respondents

Based on Table 14, students' learning outcomes, as reflected in academic grades, in the area of specialization handled by the teacher-respondents are generally high. Out of the 131 students assessed, the majority obtained Very Satisfactory grades, with 68 (51.9%) of the total. This indicates that more than half of the students demonstrated strong academic performance in their respective specialization areas. In addition, 27 students (20.6%) achieved an Outstanding level of performance, suggesting that a considerable proportion of students exceeded the expected academic standards.

Further examination of the data shows that 35 students (26.7%) obtained a Satisfactory level of performance, while only 1 student (0.8%) fell under the Fairly Satisfactory category. The very small percentage of students with fairly satisfactory performance suggests that most students met or exceeded the minimum academic expectations in the specialization courses taught by the teacher-respondents. This distribution reflects a positive learning outcome profile, with minimal lower academic performance.

The computed mean score of 87.05 and a standard deviation of 3.602 support the observed distribution of grades. The mean falls within the Very Satisfactory range, which is also reflected in the verbal description of the results. This suggests that students, on average, performed well academically in the area of specialization. The relatively low standard deviation indicates that students' grades are closely clustered around the mean, implying consistent academic performance across the group.

These findings clearly show that students' learning outcomes, as reflected in academic grades, are Very Satisfactory, highlighting the effectiveness of instruction in the specialization areas handled by the teacher-respondents. Studies have found that students demonstrate higher and more consistent academic performance when teachers use appropriate instructional strategies, clear explanations, and subject specific expertise, resulting in a greater proportion of learners achieving Very Satisfactory and Outstanding grades (Mensah et al., 2025). Large scale reviews further confirm that teacher effectiveness and professional knowledge are among the strongest school-based factors influencing student achievement, and that high mean grades with low variability indicate both instructional quality and consistency in learning outcomes (Burroughs et al., 2019).

Part III. Significant Relationship Between Teachers' Workload Allocation and Students' Learning Outcomes

This section examines whether teachers' workload allocation is significantly related to students' learning outcomes.

Specifically, it examines how teaching and non-teaching assignments, as well as the overall faculty workload, are associated with students' academic performance.

Understanding this relationship is important in determining whether the amount and type of work assigned to teachers influence how well students learn. The results presented in this section guide the reader through the analysis of the relationship between these variables and provide a basis for deciding whether teachers' workload has a meaningful impact on students' learning outcomes.

		Correlations			Interpretation	Decision
		Teaching and non-teaching assignments	Learning Outcomes	Faculty Workload		
Teaching and non-teaching assignments	Pearson Correlation	1	-.048	.010		
	p-value		.587	.913		
	N	131	131	131		
Learning Outcomes	Pearson Correlation	-.048	1	-.135	Not significant	Do not reject Ho
	p-value	.587		.125		
	N	131	131	131		
Teachers' Workload	Pearson Correlation	.010	-.135	1		
	p-value	.913	.125			
	N	131	131	131		

Table 15. Statistical Table Showing the Relationship Between Teachers' Workload, Teaching and Non-Teaching Related Assignment (independent variables) and Student Learning Outcomes (dependent variable)

Based on Table 15, the results indicate that there is no significant relationship between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes.

The computed Pearson correlation coefficients between learning outcomes and both teaching and non-teaching assignments, as well as overall teachers' workload, are very low and negligible, showing weak associations. In addition, the corresponding p-values are above the standard level of significance, indicating that the relationships are not statistically significant.

As a result, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Based on the data presented in Table 15, the correlation coefficient indicates a weak, negligible inverse association, and the probability value exceeds the conventional level of significance. This suggests that variations in the number or extent of teaching and non-teaching assignments assigned to teachers do not meaningfully correspond to changes in students' academic performance.

Similarly, the relationship between teachers' workload and student learning outcomes is weak and negative, yet statistically non-significant. The magnitude of the correlation coefficient indicates only a slight inverse relationship, suggesting that increases in teachers' workload are not substantially associated with declines or improvements in student performance. The non-significant p-value further confirms that the observed association is likely due to random variation rather than a systematic effect.

Additionally, the relationship between teaching and non-teaching assignments and overall teachers' workload is practically negligible and statistically non-significant, indicating that these dimensions operate independently within the institutional context examined. Collectively, these findings lead to the non-rejection of the null hypothesis and suggest that workload-related variables, in isolation, do not directly predict student learning outcomes.

This finding suggests that variations in teachers' workload allocation, whether related to teaching or non-teaching responsibilities, do not significantly affect students' academic learning outcomes. Therefore, students' performance appears independent of the extent of the workload assigned to the teacher-respondents, suggesting that other factors may play a more important role in determining students' learning outcomes. Several studies report that teachers' workload does not have a direct or statistically significant relationship with students' academic performance. Large scale analyses using international assessment data show that while teacher workload is related to job satisfaction, it is not significantly associated with student achievement, suggesting that increases or decreases in workload alone do not predict learning outcomes (Paloniemi Lindström, 2026). Similarly, systematic reviews indicate that workload effects on students are often indirect and weak, as student achievement is more strongly influenced by instructional quality, school climate, and learner background than by the quantity of teaching or non-teaching assignments given to teachers (Creagh et al., 2023).

From an analytical standpoint, the results imply that student achievement may be more strongly influenced by qualitative aspects of teaching, such as instructional competence, pedagogical strategies, and classroom climate, rather than the quantitative load of responsibilities assigned to teachers. The absence of significant associations also indicates that teachers may have developed adaptive coping mechanisms or institutional support structures that buffer potential negative effects of workload on instructional effectiveness. For policy and practice, these findings underscore the need to shift attention from merely reducing or redistributing workload to enhancing instructional quality and professional support systems as more plausible pathways to improving student learning outcomes.

Part IV. Challenges Encountered by the Teachers During the Implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024

This section presents the findings on the challenges encountered by teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024. This section introduces the different areas in which teachers experienced difficulties in fulfilling their professional responsibilities under the policy.

Guided by the results shown in the succeeding tables, the discussion covers challenges related to teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments. These areas reflect both instructional and non-instructional demands that form part of teachers' daily work in schools.

By analyzing these, this study was able to understand the nature and extent of the challenges faced by teachers. The discussion provides context on how workload demands, classroom conditions, and additional responsibilities may influence teachers' capacity to manage their tasks effectively.

By examining these challenges in detail, Part 4 serves as a basis for understanding the realities of policy implementation from the teachers' perspective, which will be further explored in the subsequent presentation and analysis of results.

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
Teaching Load			
1. I am assigned a teaching load that exceeds the mandated 30-hour weekly limit.	2.27	1.335	Slightly Encountered
2. I struggle to balance my instructional time with lesson planning and assessment tasks.	2.92	1.027	Moderately Encountered
3. My teaching load prevents me from providing individualized support to students.	2.65	1.183	Moderately Encountered
4. I am handling subjects that are beyond my area of specialization.	3.06	1.568	Moderately Encountered
5. My teaching load negatively affects my physical and mental well-being.	2.29	1.113	Slightly Encountered
Composite Mean	2.64	1.245	Moderately Encountered
Class Size			
1. Large class sizes make it difficult for me to manage learning effectively.	3.03	1.258	Moderately Encountered
2. I find it hard to provide individualized support to all students in large classes.	3.11	1.213	Moderately Encountered
3. Large class sizes create a noisy and less conducive learning environment.	3.49	1.230	Highly Encountered
4. Managing large classes significantly increases my workload and stress.	3.13	1.224	Moderately Encountered
5. I struggle to monitor the learning progress of each student in large classes.	2.93	1.242	Moderately Encountered
Composite Mean	3.14	1.233	Moderately Encountered
Teacher Ancillary Tasks			
1. I am assigned multiple ancillary tasks beyond the allotted two-hour limit.	2.35	1.189	Slightly Encountered
2. Ancillary tasks (e.g., reports, forms, LAC sessions) reduce my time for lesson preparation.	2.69	1.169	Moderately Encountered
3. Action research adds to my workload and lessens my focus on teaching.	2.15	1.193	Slightly Encountered
4. Completing ancillary tasks often requires me to sacrifice personal time or rest.	2.97	1.271	Moderately Encountered
5. Some ancillary tasks are irrelevant to my teaching and add to my burden.	2.56	1.241	Slightly Encountered
Composite Mean	2.55	1.213	Slightly Encountered
Teaching-related Assignments			
1. Performing teaching-related assignments such as organizing or participating in extra-curricular activities undermine my dedication to teaching duties.	2.76	1.108	Moderately Encountered
2. Serving as adviser or coordinator on teaching-related assignments adds to my workload.	2.91	1.193	Moderately Encountered
3. I sacrifice my preparation time to teach to perform teaching-related assignments.	2.82	1.115	Moderately Encountered
4. The lack of clear policies on teaching-related assignments leads to an excessive workload.	2.85	1.253	Moderately Encountered
5. Teaching-related assignments contribute to work-related stress and fatigue.	2.85	1.138	Moderately Encountered
Composite Mean	2.84	1.161	Moderately Encountered
Non-teaching Related Assignments			
1. I am often assigned tasks unrelated to teaching (e.g., community events, administrative work).	2.45	1.229	Slightly Encountered
2. Performing non-teaching related assignments lessens my time in preparing my lesson.	2.69	1.216	Moderately Encountered
3. I feel overwhelmed by the number of tasks outside my teaching responsibilities.	2.57	1.170	Slightly Encountered
4. My focus on teaching suffers because of performing non-teaching assignments.	2.45	1.172	Slightly Encountered

5. I struggle to balance my teaching duties with non-teaching assignments.	2.53	1.152	Slightly Encountered
Composite Mean	2.54	1.188	Slightly Encountered
GRAND MEAN	2.74	1.208	Moderately Encountered

Legend:

4.20 – 5.00	Very Highly Encountered (VHE)
3.40 – 4.19	Highly Encountered (HE)
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Encountered (ME)
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Encountered (SE)
1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree (SD)

Table 16. Challenges Encountered by the Teachers in the Implementation of DepEd Order no. 5, s. 2024 in Terms of Teaching Load, Class Size, Teacher Ancillary Tasks, Teaching-related, and Non-teaching Related Assignments

Challenges on Teaching Load

The results show that challenges in teaching load were moderately encountered, with a composite mean of 2.64. Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for handling subjects beyond one’s area of specialization at 3.06, followed by struggling to balance instructional time with lesson planning and assessment tasks at 2.92. Moderate difficulty was also reported for the statement that teaching load prevents individualized support to students, with a mean of 2.65. By contrast, the challenge of exceeding the mandated 30-hour weekly limit obtained only 2.27, while the item on negative effects on physical and mental well-being posted 2.29, both interpreted as slightly encountered. These figures suggest that the dominant concern was not the sheer number of teaching hours alone, but the instructional complexity attached to the load, particularly when teachers handled subjects outside their specialization and had difficulty balancing teaching with preparation and assessment.

This pattern suggests that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 may already be limiting excessive teaching hours for many teachers, yet it has not fully resolved the more complex challenge of instructional fit and work distribution. The policy protects teachers’ time by requiring six hours of actual classroom teaching within an eight-hour workday, with the remaining two hours reserved for work incidental to teaching, while the implementation guidelines call for fair and equitable assignment of teaching load and teaching related functions (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). Since the item on exceeding the weekly limit was only slightly encountered, the policy appears to be functioning in terms of preventing widespread overload by hours. However, the stronger challenge of handling subjects beyond specialization and balancing instructional time with preparation suggests that the intent of DO No. 5, s. 2024 is being only partly realized. Teachers may now be working within the protected time structure, but they still face instructional demands that make the load difficult to manage in practice. Research on teacher workload also shows that work intensification is not only about the number of hours worked, but also about the complexity and competing demands built into those hours.

This dominant result matters to students’ learning outcomes because instructional quality depends not only on how much time teachers spend teaching, but also on whether they are teaching within their area of competence and with enough time to prepare, assess, and respond to learner needs. A systematic research synthesis found that heavy workload and work intensification weaken teachers’ capacity to carry out educational priorities that support learning (Creagh et al., 2023). A systematic review also found that teacher burnout is associated with worse academic achievement and lower student motivation, which means that workload conditions can affect learners indirectly through reduced instructional quality and teacher engagement (Madigan & Kim, 2021). In this sense, the moderate challenge in teaching load suggests that even when DO No. 5, s. 2024 is containing the formal number of hours, remaining problems in specialization fit and instructional balance may still influence how well teachers can support student progress.

Challenges in Class Size

Moreover, class size emerged as the most strongly encountered challenge among the five variables, with a composite mean of 3.14, interpreted as moderately encountered, but with one indicator already reaching the highly encountered range. The highest mean was for the statement that large class sizes create a noisy and less conducive learning environment, at 3.49. This was followed by managing large classes significantly increases workload and stress at 3.13, difficulty in providing individualized support at 3.11, and difficulty in managing learning effectively at 3.03. The challenge of monitoring the learning progress of each student in large classes was also moderate at 2.93. These results show that the dominant class

size problem was the loss of conducive learning environment, alongside the strain that large classes place on monitoring, support, and overall management.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, this result suggests that workload rationalization may not be fully achieved when class size remains a major operational pressure. DO No. 5, s. 2024 protects teachers' work hours and aims to create a more conducive environment for effective teaching and learning, but the policy itself does not directly reduce the number of students in a class. This means that even when teaching hours and ancillary time are regulated, large classes can still intensify work inside those hours and make the policy's protective intent harder to realize. The results imply that implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024 may be effective in rationalizing the structure of work, but less effective in controlling the classroom conditions that magnify that work. Research has shown that workload is shaped not only by assigned duties, but also by contextual pressures such as class composition, the number of students handled, and the demands of monitoring and interaction across large groups.

This dominant result is important to students' learning outcomes because class size affects both the learning environment and the quality of teacher student interaction. Evidence from a multilevel study of primary and secondary schools found that students in smaller classes received more individual attention from teachers and had more active interaction, while classroom engagement tended to decrease in larger classes, especially for lower attaining students (Blatchford et al., 2011). A systematic review also found that smaller classes may have at least a small positive effect on reading achievement, even if effects vary across studies and contexts (Filges et al., 2018). These findings explain why the challenge posed by class size matters under DO No. 5, s. 2024. If large classes continue to produce noisy environments and hinder individualized support, then the policy's aim of strengthening teaching and learning may be weakened at the classroom level.

Challenges in Teacher Ancillary Tasks

Furthermore, Teacher ancillary tasks were slightly encountered overall, with a composite mean of 2.55, making them less problematic than teaching load and class size. However, some specific tasks still approached the moderate range. The most strongly encountered challenge was that completing ancillary tasks often requires sacrificing personal time or rest, with a mean of 2.97, followed by the statement that ancillary tasks reduce time for lesson preparation, with a mean of 2.69. Lower means were recorded for irrelevant ancillary tasks adding burden at 2.56, being assigned multiple ancillary tasks beyond the allotted two hour limit at 2.35, and action research adding to workload at 2.15. This pattern suggests that the dominant issue was not the formal amount of ancillary work itself, but the way these tasks extended into teachers' rest time and competed with lesson preparation.

This result suggests that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 may be partly achieving its purpose of streamlining ancillary duties, but not fully protecting teachers from the time pressure these tasks create. The policy explicitly reserves two hours per day for work incidental to normal teaching duties and allows ancillary tasks to be completed within or outside school premises using simple monitoring mechanisms rather than additional reporting requirements (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). Because the item on being assigned ancillary work beyond the two hour limit was only slightly encountered, the order appears to be working in terms of preventing overt overload in the formal schedule. Yet the stronger challenge of sacrificing personal time and losing time for lesson preparation implies that ancillary work may still spill over into teachers' nonwork time. This means that DO No. 5, s. 2024 may be controlling the official structure of ancillary work, but teachers still experience the practical burden of fitting these tasks into a demanding teaching day.

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because the educational value of ancillary work depends on whether it remains manageable. Some ancillary tasks, such as planning related meetings and professional learning activities, clearly support instruction. Research on lesson study showed that collaborative planning and reflection improved lesson quality, teacher competence, and student related outcomes (Bautista & Baniqued, 2021). However, workload research also shows that when additional duties consume excessive time and reduce rest or preparation, they weaken teachers' capacity to carry out the instructional priorities that matter most for learning (Creagh et al., 2023). Thus, the slight but persistent challenge in ancillary tasks suggests that DO No. 5, s. 2024 may be helping reduce overt burden, yet even moderate interference with preparation time or personal recovery can still affect the quality of learning support that students receive.

Challenges in Teaching-related Assignments

Teaching related assignments were moderately encountered, with a composite mean of 2.84. The highest indicator was that serving as adviser or coordinator in teaching related assignments adds to workload, with a mean of 2.91. Closely following were lack of clear policies on teaching related assignments leads to excessive workload at 2.85, teaching related assignments contribute to work related stress and fatigue also at 2.85, and sacrificing preparation time to perform these assignments at 2.82. The item that organizing or participating in extra curricular activities undermines dedication to teaching duties recorded the lowest mean in this set, though it remained moderate at 2.76. These results indicate that the dominant issue was the added burden and ambiguity associated with advisory and coordinative roles rather than the co curricular activities themselves.

This pattern implies that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 may not yet be fully clarifying and regulating teaching related assignments at the school level. The policy and its implementing guidelines recognize teaching related work as legitimate assignments that support learner development, and they direct school heads to ensure fair distribution in proportion to available time (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). However, the challenge scores suggest that teachers still perceive additional workload, stress, and unclear boundaries when they serve as advisers or coordinators. This means that while DO No. 5, s. 2024 has created a framework for rationalized workload, implementation may still vary in how clearly these assignments are defined and how evenly they are distributed. Research on coordinatorship workload similarly points out that additional coordinative roles require balanced workload distribution, support systems, and regular assessment to protect teacher effectiveness.

This dominant result is important to students' learning outcomes because teaching related assignments can contribute to student development when they are purposeful and well managed, but they may also weaken classroom teaching when they compete for preparation time and energy. A review and meta-analysis found that extracurricular participation in leadership, journalism, and sports was associated with generally small positive educational outcomes, although effects varied and were not always clearly causal (Shulruf, 2010). School sports research has also shown that school-based physical activity and sport can support academic performance, concentration, and classroom behavior when provided well (Trudeau & Shephard, 2008). These findings indicate that teaching related assignments can support student outcomes, but only when they do not overburden teachers. The moderate challenge shown in Table 16 therefore suggests that DO No. 5, s. 2024 still needs to ensure that teaching-related roles remain proportionate, clearly defined, and manageable if they are to benefit students without undermining core instruction.

Challenges in Non-teaching Related Assignments

Finally, non-teaching related assignments challenges were slightly encountered overall, with a composite mean of 2.54. The strongest challenge in this group was that performing non-teaching related assignments lessens time for lesson preparation, with a mean of 2.69, which already reached the moderate range. The other indicators remained in the slight range, including struggling to balance teaching duties with non-teaching assignments at 2.53, feeling overwhelmed by tasks outside teaching responsibilities at 2.57, often being assigned tasks unrelated to teaching at 2.45, and focus on teaching suffers because of non-teaching assignments also at 2.45. This pattern suggests that the dominant concern was not the frequency of non-teaching assignments alone, but the way such tasks reduced time available for preparation and instructional focus.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, the result suggests that the policy may be reducing the visible burden of non-teaching work, but not eliminating its spillover effects on teaching. The order rationalizes teachers' workload around actual classroom teaching, ancillary tasks, and teaching related assignments, while also supporting the broader policy direction of removing administrative burdens from teachers and delegating tasks outside these categories to appropriate personnel (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). Since most indicators in this section were only slightly encountered, the policy appears to be helping limit the routine assignment of clearly unrelated duties. However, the moderate result for reduced lesson preparation time suggests that even a smaller volume of non-teaching work can still disrupt teachers' core responsibilities when it competes with planning time. Research on workload has shown that even modest additional duties may intensify work when they are layered onto already full schedules and when they reduce teachers' opportunities to focus on instructional priorities.

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because lesson preparation and instructional focus are closely tied to teaching quality. When non-teaching tasks reduce preparation time, the effects may be indirect but still meaningful

for student learning. A systematic review on the impact of workload on teachers' well-being found that non-teaching tasks are among the factors associated with stress, burnout, and reduced professional capacity (Wahab et al., 2024). Another systematic review highlighted that substantial workload harms teachers' health, professional development, and daily life management, which can compromise the quality and effectiveness of education (Abdullah & Hassan, 2024). These findings explain why even slight challenges in non-teaching related assignments should not be dismissed. Under DO No. 5, s. 2024, limiting these tasks is important not only for teacher welfare but also because preserving teachers' preparation time helps protect the quality of learning experiences provided to students.

In conclusion, overall challenges encountered by teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 was moderately encountered, as indicated by the grand mean with a corresponding verbal interpretation of Moderately Encountered.

Among the identified areas, challenges related to class size and teaching-related assignments were more evident, suggesting that managing large classes and handling additional instructional responsibilities place noticeable demands on teachers. Teaching load was also moderate, indicating that while workload distribution generally aligns with policy guidelines, it still poses challenges that may affect teachers' instructional effectiveness.

In contrast, challenges associated with ancillary teacher tasks and non-teaching-related assignments were only slightly encountered, suggesting that these responsibilities are present but manageable for most teachers. The findings suggest that teachers experience moderate difficulty in implementing the policy, with instructional and classroom-related factors posing greater challenges than administrative or non-teaching duties. This indicates the need for continued support and policy refinement to help teachers better manage classroom demands and instructional responsibilities under DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

To sum it up, the findings indicate that teachers experienced a combination of moderate and slight challenges across the different dimensions of workload during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

Challenges related to teaching load were largely associated with assignment mismatches in areas of specialization, limited time for lesson preparation and assessment, and constraints in providing individualized learner support. Studies show that when teachers handle subjects outside their field of expertise, they require more preparation time and struggle to address learners' needs effectively, which increases workload pressure (Mejia et al., 2025). Other research indicates that heavy, fragmented workloads reduce time for planning, assessment, and personalized instruction, even when teachers remain committed to their teaching roles (Creagh et al., 2023).

Similarly, class size emerged as a consistent source of difficulty, particularly in managing classroom conditions, maintaining a conducive learning environment, and closely monitoring students' progress. Studies have found that as class size increases, teachers spend more time on behavior management and less time providing individualized attention, which makes it harder to track learners' academic and social development (Blatchford et al., 2011). Large scale international research also indicates that class sizes beyond optimal levels place greater demands on teachers, reducing their capacity to maintain orderly classrooms and support student learning effectively (Antonioni et al., 2024).

These concerns suggest that instructional demands were influenced not only by the number of teaching hours but also by the nature of classroom contexts and the alignment of teaching assignments with teachers' expertise. At the same time, challenges related to ancillary and non-teaching assignments were generally manageable, though they still contributed to time pressure and an imbalance in workload.

Ancillary tasks and teaching-related assignments occasionally required teachers to extend work beyond regular hours or sacrifice preparation time, especially when responsibilities lacked clear guidelines or overlapped with instructional duties. Administrative duties, coordination roles, and reporting requirements frequently consume time intended for lesson preparation and assessment, leading teachers to compensate by extending their workday (Creagh et al., 2023). Other research highlights that the density of work, rather than just the number of tasks, creates time pressure when instructional and non-instructional duties compete for the same limited hours (Longmuir & McKay, 2024).

Non-teaching related tasks were less disruptive overall but were perceived as challenging when they interfered with lesson planning. The timing and overlap of non-teaching duties with core instructional work, rather than their mere presence, create disruption and limit teachers' capacity to prepare effective lessons (Longmuir & McKay, 2024).

In conclusion, the findings reflect that teachers navigated multiple responsibilities that varied in intensity, with instructional and classroom-related factors posing more persistent challenges than administrative or non-teaching demands during the policy implementation.

Part V. Strategies Applied to Address the Challenges Encountered by the Teachers During the Implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024

This part of the chapter presents the strategies teachers use to address challenges encountered during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

It introduces the various ways teachers responded to workload demands and classroom realities, as reflected in the study's findings. The discussion is organized to show how teachers approached difficulties arising from teaching load, class size, teacher ancillary tasks, teaching-related assignments, and non-teaching-related assignments.

The results have guided this study by identifying the different strategies teachers employ, including instructional, managerial, collaborative, and personal approaches. These strategies reflect how teachers adjusted their practices, managed time and responsibilities, and sought support within the school setting to sustain effective teaching and learning.

The succeeding discussions provide a clearer understanding of how teachers coped with policy-related challenges and maintained their professional roles during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

Table 17 presents the strategies applied by the teacher-respondents to address the challenges they encounter in implementing DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024.

Indicators	F	%	Rank
Teaching Load			
<i>I am assigned a teaching load that exceeds the mandated 30-hour weekly limit.</i>			
1. I communicate with school administrators to request redistribution of teaching loads.	28	21.4	4
2. I collaborate with colleagues to share instructional materials and lesson plans.	60	45.8	3
3. I make use of technology (e.g., digital grading tools, e-classroom resources) to lessen workload.	95	72.5	1
4. I prioritize teaching tasks and set aside non-essential activities to manage time effectively.	75	57.3	2
<i>I struggle to balance my instructional time with lesson planning and assessment tasks.</i>			
1. I prepare lesson plans and instructional materials in advance.	62	47.3	2.5
2. I use templates, digital platforms, or automated tools for assessment and record-keeping.	84	64.1	1
3. I set a structured schedule that allocates specific time blocks for lesson planning, teaching, and grading.	59	45.0	4
4. I coordinate with co-teachers to share assessment tools and learning resources.	62	47.3	2.5
<i>My teaching load prevents me from providing individualized support to students.</i>			
1. I implement differentiated instruction strategies to address varied student needs within class time.	73	55.7	2
2. I create peer tutoring or group activities so students can support one another.	81	61.8	1
3. I use formative assessments and quick feedback methods (e.g., exit slips, online quizzes)	60	45.8	3
4. I maximize consultation periods or online communication platforms for struggling students.	44	33.6	4
<i>I am handling subjects that are beyond my area of specialization.</i>			
1. I attend training sessions, webinars, or professional development programs related to the subject.	71	54.2	2
2. I seek guidance and mentoring from colleagues who are experts in the subject.	68	51.9	3
3. I utilize available teaching guides, modules, and online resources to improve content knowledge.	95	72.5	1
4. I allocate more preparation time for subjects outside my specialization.	61	46.6	4
<i>My teaching load negatively affects my physical and mental well-being.</i>			
1. I practice stress management and self-care techniques such as rest, exercise, and relaxation.	88	67.2	1

2. I set boundaries between work and personal life to avoid burnout.	87	66.4	2
3. I seek emotional and professional support from colleagues, family, or administrators.	47	35.9	4
4. I prioritize essential tasks and delegate or minimize less urgent activities.	65	49.6	3
Class Size			
<i>Large class sizes make it difficult for me to manage learning effectively.</i>			
1. I establish clear classroom routines and rules to maintain order.	93	71.0	1
2. I design engaging and interactive activities to capture students' attention.	74	56.5	2
3. I assign classroom roles (e.g., group leaders) to help manage peer accountability.	73	55.7	3
4. I use seating arrangements that promote easier monitoring and participation.	65	49.6	4
<i>I find it hard to provide individualized support to all students in large classes.</i>			
1. I implement differentiated instruction strategies to address varied learning needs.	81	61.8	1
2. I use peer tutoring or group work to provide additional support for struggling learners.	77	58.8	2
3. I maximize formative assessments to quickly identify who needs extra help.	64	48.9	3
4. I allot consultation or remedial sessions outside class for students needing more attention.	42	32.1	4
<i>Large class sizes create a noisy and less conducive learning environment.</i>			
1. I implement noise-control strategies such as signals, hand-raising, or silent routines.	74	56.5	2
2. I use cooperative learning structures that minimize off-task behavior	70	53.4	3.5
3. I position myself strategically in the classroom to maintain presence and control.	75	57.3	1
4. I design activities that keep all students actively engaged to reduce disruption.	70	53.4	3.5
<i>Managing large classes significantly increases my workload and stress.</i>			
1. I delegate minor classroom tasks (e.g., distributing materials) to student leaders.	70	53.4	2
2. I use digital or simplified grading systems to save time.	78	59.5	1
3. I coordinate with colleagues for shared lesson plans and teaching resources.	55	42.0	4
4. I practice stress management and self-care routines to cope with the workload.	68	51.9	3
<i>I struggle to monitor the learning progress of each student in large classes.</i>			
1. I use quick formative assessments (e.g., exit tickets, short quizzes) to track progress.	90	68.7	1
2. I maintain student portfolios or progress checklists for systematic monitoring.	71	54.2	2
3. I use digital tools (e.g., online quizzes, apps) to collect and analyze performance data.	51	38.9	3
4. I conduct small group discussions or targeted interventions for students who need support.	39	29.8	4
Teacher Ancillary Tasks			
<i>I am assigned multiple ancillary tasks beyond the allotted two-hour limit.</i>			
1. I request a review of ancillary task assignments from school administrators.	25	19.1	4
2. I advocate for equal distribution of ancillary tasks among teachers.	52	39.7	3
3. I negotiate for ancillary roles that align with my expertise.	57	43.5	2
4. I collaborate with colleagues to share responsibility for some ancillary work.	73	55.7	1
<i>Ancillary tasks (e.g., reports, forms, LAC sessions) reduce my time for lesson preparation.</i>			
1. I use digital tools and templates to streamline the completion of reports and forms.	69	52.7	2.5
2. I schedule fixed time slots for paperwork to avoid disrupting lesson preparation.	69	52.7	2.5
3. I prioritize urgent reports while delegating or simplifying less important tasks.	72	55.0	1
4. I coordinate with colleagues to share resources for LAC sessions and reporting.	56	42.0	4
<i>Action research adds to my workload and lessens my focus on teaching.</i>			
1. I collaborate with peers to conduct joint action research projects.	51	38.9	3
2. I align my action research with actual classroom issues to reduce extra workload.	54	41.2	2
3. I use existing data and teaching records as part of my research to save time.	45	34.4	4
4. I seek mentoring from experienced teachers or coordinators for research guidance.	63	48.1	1
<i>Completing ancillary tasks often requires me to sacrifice personal time or rest.</i>			
1. I practice time management by setting limits for completing school paperwork.	92	70.2	1
2. I request deadline adjustments when tasks overlap with heavy teaching load.	52	39.7	3
3. I delegate non-critical ancillary responsibilities whenever possible.	37	28.2	4
4. I maintain a balance between school obligations and self-care routines.	73	55.7	2
<i>Some ancillary tasks are irrelevant to my teaching and add to my burden.</i>			
1. I communicate with administrators to clarify or decline irrelevant assignments.	59	45.0	2
2. I advocate for task assignments that are more related to my expertise.	72	55.0	1
3. I suggest delegating non-relevant tasks to non-teaching personnel.	47	35.9	3
4. I recommend streamlining or removing unnecessary paperwork.	46	35.1	4
Teaching-related Assignments			
<i>Performing teaching-related assignments such as organizing or participating in extra-curricular activities undermine my dedication to teaching duties.</i>			

1.	I set clear boundaries to limit extra-curricular responsibilities during peak academic periods.	81	61.8	1
2.	I request fair distribution of extracurricular activities among faculty members.	46	35.1	3
3.	I integrate extra-curricular activities into classroom learning when possible.	57	43.5	2
4.	I delegate tasks and involve students in organizing extra-curricular events.	41	31.3	4
<i>Serving as adviser or coordinator on teaching-related assignments adds to my workload.</i>				
1.	I request workload adjustments or recognition for adviser/coordinator responsibilities.	55	42.0	3
2.	I share responsibilities with co-advisers or student leaders.	77	58.8	1
3.	I use digital tools to manage adviser/coordinator tasks efficiently.	62	47.3	2
4.	I advocate for rotation of adviser roles among teachers.	33	25.2	4
<i>I sacrifice my preparation time to teach to perform teaching-related assignments.</i>				
1.	I prioritize lesson planning and allocate fixed time slots for extra assignments.	69	52.7	1
2.	I request rescheduling or adjustment of teaching-related activities that conflict with preparation.	40	30.5	4
3.	I collaborate with colleagues to co-develop instructional materials.	57	43.5	3
4.	I use time-saving techniques such as lesson templates and ready-made assessment tools.	63	48.1	2
<i>The lack of clear policies on teaching-related assignments leads to an excessive workload.</i>				
1.	I communicate with administrators to request clearer guidelines on teaching-related tasks.	54	41.2	2.5
2.	I advocate for written policies on the fair assignment of extra duties.	40	30.5	4
3.	I participate in faculty meetings to raise workload distribution concerns.	76	58.0	1
4.	I suggest the creation of committees to manage teaching-related assignments systematically.	54	41.2	2.5
<i>Teaching-related assignments contribute to work-related stress and fatigue.</i>				
1.	I practice stress management and self-care strategies to maintain well-being.	87	66.4	1
2.	I delegate or share responsibilities with colleagues and student officers.	51	38.9	3
3.	I balance work by scheduling time for relaxation and recovery.	79	60.3	2
4.	I seek administrative or peer support when tasks become overwhelming.	48	36.6	4
Non-teaching Related Assignments				
<i>I am often assigned tasks unrelated to teaching (e.g., community events, administrative work).</i>				
1.	I communicate with administrators to clarify the scope of my responsibilities.	56	42.7	2
2.	I request delegation of non-teaching tasks to non-teaching personnel when possible.	40	30.5	4
3.	I manage my time by scheduling non-teaching tasks outside peak instructional periods.	86	65.6	1
4.	I advocate for policies limiting teachers' involvement in non-teaching tasks.	53	32.8	3
<i>Performing non-teaching related assignments lessens my time in preparing my lesson.</i>				
1.	I prioritize lesson preparation before non-teaching tasks.	82	62.6	1
2.	I make use of ready-made instructional materials and digital resources to save time.	49	60.3	3
3.	I request adjustments in deadlines for non-teaching assignments.	35	26.7	4
4.	I coordinate with colleagues to share or exchange lesson materials.	50	38.2	2
<i>I feel overwhelmed by the number of tasks outside my teaching responsibilities.</i>				
1.	I practice stress management techniques (e.g., relaxation, mindfulness, exercise).	99	75.6	1
2.	I seek administrative or peer support when non-teaching tasks become excessive.	60	45.8	2
3.	I delegate minor responsibilities to colleagues or student leaders when possible.	41	31.3	3.5
4.	I prioritize essential non-teaching tasks and let go of less important ones.	41	31.3	3.5
<i>My focus on teaching suffers because of performing non-teaching assignments.</i>				
1.	I request administrative adjustments to reduce non-teaching workload.	37	28.2	3
2.	I integrate time management strategies to balance teaching and extra tasks.	99	75.6	1
3.	I set clear boundaries between instructional duties and non-teaching assignments.	62	47.3	2
4.	I document the impact of non-teaching tasks and raise the issue during faculty meetings.	30	22.9	4
<i>I struggle to balance my teaching duties with non-teaching assignments.</i>				
1.	I create a structured schedule to allocate time fairly between teaching and non-teaching tasks.	75	57.3	1
2.	I prioritize core teaching duties before addressing non-teaching responsibilities.	64	48.9	3
3.	I collaborate with peers to divide non-teaching tasks more effectively.	44	33.6	4
4.	I practice self-care and rest to maintain productivity and avoid burnout.	65	49.6	2

Table 17. Strategies Employed by the Teachers in the Implementation of DepEd Order no. 5, s. 2024 in Terms of Teaching Load, Class Size, Teacher Ancillary Tasks, Teaching-related, and Non-teaching Related Assignments

Based on Table 17, the teachers applied a variety of strategies to address the challenges encountered during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, indicating active efforts to manage workload and instructional demands.

Strategies for Teaching Load Challenges

The results show that teachers most often relied on technology, planning, and peer support to cope with teaching load concerns. When teaching load exceeded the weekly limit, the most common response was the use of technology such as digital grading tools and online resources at 72.5 percent, followed by prioritizing essential teaching tasks at 57.3 percent. In balancing instructional time with lesson planning and assessment, the leading strategy was the use of templates, digital platforms, or automated tools for assessment and record keeping at 64.1 percent. To address limited capacity for individualized support, the most frequently employed approach was peer tutoring or group activities at 61.8 percent, while for teaching outside specialization, the leading response was the use of teaching guides, modules, and online resources at 72.5 percent. In dealing with the effects of load on well-being, the most common strategy was stress management and self-care at 67.2 percent, closely followed by setting boundaries between work and personal life at 66.4 percent. These results indicate that teachers were responding to teaching load challenges mainly through personal regulation, technology use, and collaborative classroom practices rather than through administrative redistribution.

This pattern suggests that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 may be creating a work structure where teachers still manage pressure at the classroom level, even if the policy protects formal work hours. The order provides that teachers shall render six hours of actual classroom teaching within an eight-hour workday, while the implementation guidelines support proportionate allocation of work and recognize ancillary tasks as part of legitimate teaching related duties (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). Yet the dominance of self-managed and technology-based strategies suggests that teachers often cope with workload pressure through their own adjustments rather than through reduced demands. This implies that DO No. 5, s. 2024 may be effective in setting boundaries for work structure, but actual implementation still requires teachers to actively optimize time, materials, and support systems within those boundaries. This interpretation is consistent with workload research showing that even when hours are regulated, the complexity and intensification of tasks still shape teachers' lived experience of work (Creagh et al., 2023).

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because the strategies teachers use to manage load can either preserve or weaken instructional quality. Technology aided grading, structured planning, peer tutoring, and content support tools may help sustain teaching effectiveness when workload is high. Research has shown that collaborative planning and reflective work improve lesson quality and teacher competence, while better teacher collaboration is associated with gains in mathematics and reading achievement (Bautista & Baniqued, 2021; Ronfeldt et al., 2015). At the same time, a systematic synthesis found that workload and work intensification reduce teachers' capacity to deliver educational priorities that support learning, which means the benefits of these strategies depend on whether they successfully prevent overload (Creagh et al., 2023). The prominence of these coping strategies therefore suggests that students' learning outcomes may be better supported when teachers can convert workload pressure into organized and collaborative practice rather than into lost preparation time or reduced learner support.

Strategies for Class-Size Challenges

For class size challenges, the most common strategies centered on classroom control, differentiated instruction, and quick monitoring tools. To manage learning effectively in large classes, the most frequently reported strategy was establishing clear classroom routines and rules at 71.0 percent. For difficulty in providing individualized support, the leading strategy was differentiated instruction at 61.8 percent, followed by peer tutoring or group work at 58.8 percent. In dealing with noisy and less conducive learning environments, the most frequent response was positioning oneself strategically in the classroom at 57.3 percent. When large classes increased workload and stress, the leading strategy was the use of digital or simplified grading systems at 59.5 percent. For monitoring student learning progress, the dominant response was the use of quick formative assessments such as exit tickets and short quizzes at 68.7 percent. These results show that teachers primarily addressed class size challenges through proactive management routines and instructional adaptation rather than through structural reductions in class size.

This pattern suggests that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 may be protecting teachers' formal time, but it does not remove the classroom pressures created by large groups of learners. The policy rationalizes teaching load and ancillary work within an eight-hour day, yet large class size remains a contextual condition that intensifies the amount of

management, feedback, and monitoring that teachers must perform within those protected hours (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). The strong reliance on routines, formative checks, and differentiated instruction suggests that teachers are making practical adjustments to uphold the policy's instructional intent even when class size makes implementation difficult. In this sense, DO No. 5, s. 2024 may be helping preserve time for teaching, but the effectiveness of that time still depends heavily on how well teachers can cope with large classes. This is consistent with the literature showing that workload pressure is shaped not only by formal assignments but also by contextual classroom demands such as the number of students handled and the complexity of monitoring them.

This dominant result is important to students' learning outcomes because the strategies used in large classes directly affect engagement, support, and progress monitoring. Evidence from classroom observation research shows that smaller classes allow more individual teacher attention and more active teacher student interaction, while classroom engagement decreases in larger classes, especially for lower attaining students (Blatchford et al., 2011). At the same time, research suggests that formative assessment practices and structured classroom management can help teachers monitor learning more effectively when class size is large (Brandmo & Gamlem, 2025; Filges et al., 2018). The heavy use of quick formative assessments and differentiated instruction in Table 17 therefore matters because these strategies may help protect student learning outcomes when class size itself cannot be reduced under current school conditions.

Strategies for Teacher Ancillary Tasks Challenges

The dominant strategies for teacher ancillary tasks combined collaboration, prioritization, mentoring, and time limits. When teachers were assigned multiple ancillary tasks beyond the allotted time, the most common response was to collaborate with colleagues to share responsibility at 55.7 percent. When ancillary tasks reduced lesson preparation time, the leading strategy was to prioritize urgent reports while simplifying less important tasks at 55.0 percent. For action research concerns, the most common strategy was to seek mentoring from experienced teachers or coordinators at 48.1 percent. When ancillary work required sacrificing personal time or rest, the strongest response was time management through setting limits for paperwork at 70.2 percent, followed by maintaining balance between school obligations and self-care at 55.7 percent. When some ancillary tasks were seen as irrelevant, the dominant strategy was to advocate for assignments more closely related to one's expertise at 55.0 percent. These results indicate that teachers dealt with ancillary work mainly by coordinating with peers, controlling time, and trying to align tasks more closely with professional fit.

In relation to DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, this suggests that teachers are responding to ancillary work within the policy framework, but they still need to manage the practical burden of how those tasks are scheduled and distributed. The order reserves two hours per day for work incidental to normal teaching duties and allows these tasks to be completed within or outside school premises using simplified documentation systems (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). The dominance of collaborative sharing, prioritization, and requests for task alignment implies that implementation is not simply about keeping ancillary work within a formal time limit. It is also about whether schools distribute those duties meaningfully and in ways that do not disrupt lesson preparation and rest. In this sense, the policy may have succeeded in defining ancillary work as legitimate and bounded, but teachers still need local strategies to keep that work manageable. This interpretation is supported by workload studies showing that non instructional duties become problematic when they compete with time for core teaching functions and recovery.

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because ancillary tasks influence how much time and energy teachers can still devote to preparation and classroom support. Some ancillary tasks can strengthen instruction, particularly when they involve professional learning and collaborative planning. Research on lesson study showed that collaborative planning improves lesson quality and teacher competence, which in turn supports student related outcomes (Bautista & Baniqued, 2021). However, workload research also shows that time poverty and work intensification reduce teachers' ability to carry out educational priorities effectively, particularly when those duties intrude on rest and lesson preparation (Creagh et al., 2023; Wahab et al., 2024). The strategies in Table 17 therefore matter because they represent ways teachers try to preserve the instructional core of their work while still completing ancillary duties under DO No. 5, s. 2024.

Strategies for Teaching-related Assignments Challenges

For teaching related assignments, the dominant strategies emphasized boundary setting, shared responsibility, prioritization, participation in policy discussion, and self-care. When extracurricular work threatened dedication to teaching duties, the most common strategy was to set clear boundaries during peak academic periods at 61.8 percent. When

adviser or coordinator roles added to workload, the leading strategy was to share responsibilities with co advisers or student leaders at 58.8 percent. When teachers sacrificed preparation time, the strongest strategy was to prioritize lesson planning and allocate fixed time slots for extra assignments at 52.7 percent. When lack of clear policies created excessive workload, the dominant response was to raise workload distribution concerns during faculty meetings at 58.0 percent. When these assignments contributed to stress and fatigue, the most common strategy was stress management and self care at 66.4 percent, followed by balancing work through scheduled recovery time at 60.3 percent. These results suggest that teachers often responded to teaching related assignments by protecting teaching time, sharing roles, and using faculty level discussion to clarify or improve task distribution.

This pattern implies that the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 is prompting teachers to negotiate a workable balance between instructional duties and cocurricular or coordinative roles. The policy and its guidelines recognize teaching related assignments as part of the teaching and learning process, but they also call for fair distribution and proportionate allocation of responsibilities according to available time (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). The dominant use of boundary setting, shared roles, and faculty meetings indicates that the success of implementation depends not only on the written provisions of the order but also on how schools interpret and operationalize them. Teachers' active involvement in negotiating roles through meetings and workload concerns suggests that the policy is still being translated into school practice. This is consistent with research showing that additional duties can support professional growth and student engagement, yet they also create workload and time management challenges when not clearly structured.

This dominant result matters to students' learning outcomes because teaching related assignments can both enrich and compete with classroom instruction. Extracurricular and cocurricular activities such as journalism, sports, and student leadership can support student development, school engagement, and certain educational outcomes when implemented well (Shulruf, 2010; Trudeau & Shephard, 2008). Yet the same literature also warns that such roles yield benefits only when they do not draw too heavily on teachers' time and attention away from instruction. A systematic research synthesis found that heavy workload reduces teachers' capacity to focus on the priorities that most directly support student learning (Creagh et al., 2023). Thus, the strategies observed in Table 17 are important because they show how teachers try to keep teaching related assignments supportive rather than disruptive to students' learning under the implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024.

Strategies for Non-teaching Related Assignments Challenges

The dominant strategies for non-teaching related assignments were strongly centered on time management, lesson priority, stress regulation, and structured scheduling. When assigned tasks unrelated to teaching, the most common response was to schedule non-teaching tasks outside peak instructional periods at 65.6 percent. When non-teaching work reduced lesson preparation time, the dominant strategy was to prioritize lesson preparation before non-teaching tasks at 62.6 percent. When teachers felt overwhelmed by tasks outside teaching responsibilities, the strongest response was stress management techniques at 75.6 percent. The same percentage, 75.6 percent, appeared as the leading strategy when teachers said their focus on teaching suffered, this time through time management strategies to balance teaching and extra tasks. When balancing teaching and non-teaching assignments, the most common strategy was to create a structured schedule at 57.3 percent. These results show that teachers primarily responded to non-teaching tasks by guarding instructional time and using personal regulation strategies rather than by delegating those tasks elsewhere.

This pattern suggests that even under DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, teachers still need to actively defend teaching time from the disruptive effects of non-teaching work. The policy rationalizes workload around classroom teaching, ancillary tasks, and teaching related assignments, and it aligns with the broader direction of limiting teachers' involvement in functions unrelated to teaching and learning (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). The fact that the dominant strategies are mostly personal scheduling and task prioritization suggests that formal workload protection alone may not fully eliminate the intrusion of non-teaching work into teachers' instructional routines. This means that implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024 may be reducing the frequency of such assignments, yet teachers still experience a need to shield lesson preparation and teaching focus from them. Research on workload and teacher well-being supports this view by showing that even relatively limited non-teaching demands can intensify stress when they are layered onto full teaching schedules.

This dominant result is important to students' learning outcomes because protecting lesson preparation time is directly linked to instructional quality. When teachers prioritize teaching before non-teaching assignments, they are effectively preserving the conditions needed for planning, feedback, and learner support. A review of workload research found that

non-teaching tasks can negatively affect teachers' health, professional development, and daily work management, all of which shape the quality of teaching delivered to students (Abdullah & Hassan, 2024; Wahab et al., 2024). Another systematic review found evidence that teacher burnout is associated with worse academic achievement and lower student motivation, showing that even indirect pressures on teacher focus may matter for student outcomes (Madigan & Kim, 2021). For this reason, the strategies teachers use to limit the effect of non-teaching assignments are important under DO No. 5, s. 2024, because they help preserve the instructional preparation and attention that students need for stronger learning outcomes.

In general, these findings show that teachers demonstrated strong adaptability and initiative in responding to the challenges posed by the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024. Across different workload areas, teachers consistently applied practical, resource-based strategies to manage teaching demands, address class-size concerns, and handle additional responsibilities.

The frequent use of technology, collaboration with colleagues, and access to shared instructional resources emerged as common approaches in addressing teaching load, lesson preparation, and specialization-related concerns. Digital tools and shared materials help reduce repetitive work and save time, allowing teachers to focus more on instruction and assessment (Creagh et al., 2023). Other research highlights that collaboration, such as peer support, coaching, and shared planning, strengthens instructional practice and helps teachers cope with complex teaching demands, even when workloads are high (Kraft et al., 2018). Recent analyses further emphasize that access to common resources and collective work practices reduce the density of individual workloads and support more sustainable teaching conditions (Longmuir & McKay, 2024).

Teachers also showed conscious efforts to manage time and stress by prioritizing essential tasks, setting boundaries between work and personal life, and practicing self-care. Studies explain that when teachers face heavy and complex workloads, they often cope by focusing on high impact tasks, protecting personal time, and developing routines that prevent emotional exhaustion (Creagh et al., 2023). Other research further demonstrates that strategies such as boundary setting and self-care help reduce stress and support teachers' well-being, even when time pressure remains high (Zhu et al., 2024).

In addressing instructional challenges, particularly those related to large classes, teachers relied on differentiated instruction, peer support strategies, formative assessment, and structured classroom management techniques to maintain student engagement and monitor learning progress. Studies on differentiated instruction explain that adapting content, process, and tasks allows teachers to respond to diverse learner needs, which is especially important in large classrooms (Deunk et al., 2018). Research on formative assessment further shows that ongoing feedback and monitoring help teachers identify learning gaps and adjust instruction even when individual attention is limited (Black & Wiliam, 1998). In addition, classroom management studies highlight that clear routines, structure, and peer supported learning strategies reduce disruptions and help teachers maintain a conducive learning environment in large classes (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006).

At the same time, the findings reveal that teachers employed deliberate strategies to manage ancillary, teaching-related, and non-teaching-related tasks without compromising instructional quality. Collaboration and fair task sharing were frequently used to reduce the burden of ancillary and teaching-related assignments, while digital tools and templates streamlined reports, documentation, and coordination. Studies explain that collaborative practices, such as shared planning and peer support, help distribute teaching related and ancillary tasks more evenly, reducing individual workload pressure (Creagh et al., 2023). Other research indicates that structured collaboration and coaching improve instructional practice while helping teachers manage complex responsibilities (Kraft et al., 2018). In addition, recent studies note that the use of digital tools, templates, and shared resources streamlines documentation, reporting, and coordination tasks, reducing the workload density and helping teachers maintain focus on instruction (Longmuir & McKay, 2024).

Teachers also actively communicated with administrators to clarify roles, advocate for clearer policies, and suggest workload adjustments when responsibilities became excessive or unclear. Boundary setting, scheduling strategies, and delegation were commonly applied to protect lesson preparation time and reduce stress from non-teaching-related duties. Studies explain that open communication with administrators and role clarification help reduce confusion, protect instructional time, and prevent work overload from spilling into lesson preparation (Creagh et al., 2023). Other research indicates that teachers commonly use boundary-setting, scheduling strategies, and delegation to manage stress and preserve time for core teaching tasks, particularly when non-teaching duties increase (Longmuir & McKay, 2024). In addition, studies on time pressure and well-being show that setting limits and seeking organizational support are effective coping strategies that reduce emotional exhaustion and help teachers sustain instructional quality (Zhu et al., 2024).

This study found that teachers have proactive, reflective, and strategic responses to workload challenges, demonstrating their commitment to sustaining effective teaching and learning while navigating the demands of policy implementation.

Part VI. Policy Recommendations

Based from the results of this study, the researcher developed a set of Policy Recommendations in a paper titled 'Sustaining Workload Policy, Protecting Planning Time, and Strengthening Teaching Quality and Student Support', which aims to preserve the gains of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, to strengthen compliance and accountability, to protect time for core instructional work, and to ensure that regulated teacher time leads to better teaching practice and stronger learner support. (see Appendix A)

Accordingly, it advances three specific policy recommendations such as 1) sustaining the present workload policy through light quarterly compliance monitoring, 2) preserving and strengthening protected time for lesson planning and Learning Action Cell sessions, and 3) maintaining a clear policy focus on teaching quality and student learning support through coaching, formative assessment, classroom management development, and school based interventions for learners who need added assistance.

Implementation proceeds through a three-phase sequence within one school year. First, schools adopt common quarterly workload templates, orient implementation teams, and review schedules for lesson planning and Learning Action Cell work. Next, schools operationalize light compliance reporting, protect fixed planning and collaborative time, strengthen coaching and classroom assessment support, and launch targeted tutoring or tiered interventions for learners who need added assistance. Finally, divisions review compliance data, teacher feedback, coaching participation, and learner support results to refine the model and expand effective practices. This implementation is expected to sustain reasonable workload allocation, protect instructional time, improve the quality of collaboration and classroom practice, and strengthen learner support through better feedback, classroom climate, and timely intervention.

Conclusion and Implications

Summary of Findings

The following are a concise synthesis of the significant results of the study based on the analysis of the gathered data:

1. The findings indicate that during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024, teacher's workload allocation was generally regulated.
 - 1.1. Majority of teachers spent 61 to 90 minutes on lesson planning and 61 to 120 minutes per month on LAC sessions, for an estimated combined workload of 105 minutes or 1.75 hours per week, which stayed within the allotted time.
 - 1.2. In addition, major number of teachers handled classes of 36 to 45 students at 63.4%, while only 16.0% had 16 to 25 students, 15.3% had 26 to 35 students, and very few handled either 15 students and below at 3.1% or 46 students and above at 2.3%, showing that the dominant workload allocation in terms of class size was concentrated within the 36 to 45 learner range which is within the regular or standard class sizes.
 - 1.3. Moreover, teachers' ancillary workload was mainly concentrated on assessment of learners' progress at 210 minutes or 3.5 hours per week, followed by preparation of instructional materials and attendance recording at 150 minutes or 2.5 hours, homeroom guidance and management at 135 minutes or 2.25 hours, and lesson planning with LAC participation at 105 minutes or 1.75 hours, all of which remained within the allotted time under DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 of 600 minutes per week.
 - 1.4. Furthermore, teachers' workload allocation in teaching related assignments was generally limited to a small group, with most teachers not assigned extra roles, while the most common assignments were learning area chairmanship at 34.4%, reading literacy and numeracy coordinatorship at 21.4%, sports development at 16.8%, school paper at 14.5%, grade level chairmanship at 13.7%, ICT and guidance and advocacy at 13.0% each, SSLG advisership at 6.9%, research at 3.1%, and both SNED and inclusive education at 0.8%.

1.5. Lastly, most teachers had no non-teaching related assignments at 67.9%, while only a very small number handled scattered extra roles such as YES O Coordinator at 2.3% and BKD Adviser at 1.5%, showing that non-teaching duties were generally limited and assigned only to selected teachers during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024.

2. The findings indicate that students generally achieved strong academic performance in the teacher's area of specialization, where the mean grade of 87.05 reflects a Very Satisfactory level of learning outcomes.
3. The findings show that there was no significant relationship between teacher's workload allocation and students learning outcomes. The correlation results showed very low and negligible values with probability values higher than the level of significance, indicating that variations in teaching and non-teaching assignments did not affect students' academic grades.
4. This study found that teachers experienced an overall moderate level of challenges during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024, as reflected by a grand mean described as *Moderately Encountered*.

4.1. It was specifically found that teachers experienced a moderate level of challenges related to teaching load as reflected by a composite mean of 2.64 described as *Moderately Encountered*. The most common challenge was handling subjects outside their area of specialization, while concerns such as exceeding the 30-hour teaching limit and effects on physical and mental well-being were only slightly encountered.

4.2. In addition, the findings show that teachers experienced moderate challenges related to class size, as indicated by a composite mean of 3.14 described as *Moderately Encountered*. Large class size was commonly reported as causing a noisy learning environment and difficulty in classroom management.

4.3. Moreover, teachers slightly encountered challenges related to ancillary tasks with a composite mean of 2.55 described as *Slightly Encountered*.

4.4. Furthermore, teachers moderately encountered challenges related to teaching related tasks as indicated by a composite mean described as *Moderately Encountered*.

4.5. Lastly, challenges related to non-teaching related tasks as reflected by a composite mean of 2.54 described as *Slightly Encountered*.

5. The findings show that most teachers applied various strategies to address the challenges encountered during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024. Teachers commonly used technology collaboration with colleagues shared instructional resources time management boundary setting and self-care strategies to manage teaching load, large class size, ancillary tasks, and non-teaching duties.

5.1. This study found that most teachers applied various strategies to manage teaching load challenges during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024. Teachers commonly used technology integration instructional resources and collaboration with colleagues, while many also practiced task prioritization stress management and differentiated instruction to handle time demands large classes and limited individualized support.

5.2. In addition, the findings show that most teachers applied various strategies to manage challenges related to class size. Teachers commonly used classroom routines engaging activities differentiated instruction peer tutoring and collaborative practices to support learners manage large classes and reduce workload and stress.

5.3. Moreover, data show that teachers applied various strategies to manage challenges related to ancillary tasks. Most teachers used collaboration with colleagues digital tools time management and task prioritization to handle reports forms LAC sessions and action research while setting limits to protect lesson preparation time and personal well-being.

5.4. Furthermore, most teachers applied various strategies to manage challenges related to teaching related assignments. Teachers commonly set boundaries for extra duties shared responsibilities with colleagues and student leaders and used digital tools and ready-made materials to save time.

5.5. Lastly, data show that most teachers applied various strategies to manage challenges related to non-teaching load. Many teachers focused on scheduling non-teaching tasks outside peak teaching hours,

prioritizing lesson preparation, and setting clear boundaries between instructional and non-instructional duties.

6. A policy recommendation on teacher workload, instructional quality, and student learning outcomes was produced based on the research findings. It emphasizes sustaining the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5 s. 2024 while strengthening school support systems. The recommendation focuses on maintaining balanced workload practices while promoting teacher well-being, instructional quality, and continued student academic performance.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusions

The conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study in relation to the research objectives and problems:

1. DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 generally achieved a regulated and manageable distribution of teachers' workload by keeping core, ancillary, teaching related, and non-teaching related duties within policy limits while allowing most teachers to remain primarily focused on classroom instruction.
2. Students' learning outcomes, in terms of academic grades in the area of specialization handled by the teacher-respondents, were very satisfactory. Most students achieved *Very Satisfactory* to *Outstanding* grades, with an overall mean of 87.05 and only a very small number falling below satisfactory performance.
3. No significant relationship existed between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes. The correlation results showed very low and negligible values with probability levels higher than the level of significance, indicating that differences in teaching and non-teaching assignments did not affect students' academic grades. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted.
4. Teachers encountered a moderate level of challenges during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024. Class size, teaching-related assignments, and teaching load were the most evident concerns, whereas challenges related to ancillary tasks and non-teaching-related assignments were only slightly encountered. This suggests that instructional and classroom-related demands posed greater difficulty than administrative duties.
5. Teachers addressed workload challenges through practical and adaptive strategies such as technology use, collaboration, shared resources, time management, boundary setting, and self-care. These strategies helped teachers manage teaching load, large classes, ancillary tasks, and non-teaching duties while maintaining focus on classroom instruction.
6. This study developed a policy recommendation based on the research findings. The development of these recommendations establishes that DepEd should sustain and closely monitor the present workload policy, firmly protect lesson planning and LAC time, and strengthen instructional quality, assessment, classroom management, and learner support so that regulated teacher time leads to more consistent, effective, and equitable learning outcomes.

Recommendations

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

1. Given that the findings revealed that teachers' workload allocation during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 was generally regulated, school administrators may continue to ensure the proper implementation of the policy.
2. Considering the "*Very Satisfactory*" learning outcomes demonstrated by students, teachers and school leaders may continue implementing effective instructional strategies and learning support mechanisms that contribute to positive student academic performance. Schools may also strengthen monitoring and feedback systems to further support continuous improvement in teaching practices.
3. Given that no significant relationship was found between teachers' workload allocation and students' learning outcomes, future researchers may examine additional variables that may influence student achievement, such as

teaching strategies, student motivation, school resources, learning environment, and parental support. Expanding the scope of future studies may provide a deeper understanding of factors affecting student learning outcomes.

4. Considering that teachers experienced a moderate level of challenges during the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024, particularly in terms of teaching load, class size, and teaching-related assignments, school administrators may strengthen institutional support mechanisms by aligning teaching assignments with teachers' areas of specialization, providing professional development opportunities, and improving resource availability to assist teachers in managing workload demands.
5. As reflected in the findings, teachers applied various strategies such as technology integration, collaboration with colleagues, shared instructional resources, time management, boundary setting, and self-care schools may encourage the continued use and sharing of these effective practices through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, collaborative planning activities, and professional learning communities. These initiatives may help teachers sustain instructional effectiveness while managing workload challenges.
6. Furthermore, the proposed policy recommendations of this study may be considered by the Department of Education and school administrators to further strengthen the implementation of DepEd Order No. 5, s. 2024 by promoting balanced workload allocation, enhancing teacher support systems, and sustaining quality instruction and student learning outcomes in public secondary schools
7. Finally, future researchers may expand this study by including more schools, increasing sample size, or using qualitative methods such as interviews and focus group discussions to gain deeper insights into teacher workload experiences. They may also evaluate the sufficiency of the allotted two hours for ancillary tasks and teaching and non-teaching related assignments. Additionally, future studies may explore other factors affecting student learning outcomes, such as teaching strategies, school climate, or student background, since workload alone showed no significant relationship with academic performance. Finally, future researchers may use other and more updated DepEd Orders and memorandum on controlling central issuances on teaching workloads and relevant matters.

Acknowledgement

The researcher extends his heartfelt gratitude to Almighty Father for giving him abundant blessings such as gift of wisdom, skills, caring and health, for him to be strong and determined in every obstacle that comes along the way, as well as to endure all the hardships and pains in order to finish this great undertaking. The researcher also expresses his appreciation to the following institutions and persons who extended their most valuable assistance for the realization on this study.

First and foremost, my utmost gratitude to Marinduque State University Graduate School extended to Eastern Quezon College, Inc., for being the instrument for the teachers to pursue their dreams and continue their professional development.

To Dr. Noel R. Palomares, his statistician, for his invaluable guidance and expertise in analyzing the data.

To Dr. Annalyn J. Decena, his editor, for her careful review, constructive feedback, and unwavering support in improving the clarity and quality of the manuscript.

To Dr. Nikka Mae J. Adling, his copy editor, for her meticulous attention to detail and dedication in refining the final draft of this study.

To Dr. Leodegario M. Jalos, Jr., his adviser and Chair of the Graduate Program of Marinduque State University, for being approachable, accommodating, and hands-on in guiding his advisees, for always providing valuable updates and improvements to my research study, and for generously sharing his expertise in the field of research and management.

To Dr. Marites C. Tañada, the Dean of Graduate Studies in Eastern Quezon College, Inc., for her unwavering support and guidance.

To Ms. Liezl M. Manoy, for always extending her assistance, which greatly contributed to the completion of this study.

To his school principal, Chona L. Canzana, for her guidance, leadership, and unwavering support in fostering a conducive environment for professional and academic growth.

To his family, for their encouragement, untiring support, and believing in him in the completion of the research study.

To all his friends and colleagues, for their moral support and encouragement to accomplish this study.

To his loving and supportive wife, Marie Joy A. Atienza.

Above all, an endless gratitude to Almighty God, who showers the researcher strength, health and guidance to conquer all the trials encountered in the whole process of this research journey.

Funding

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study; all data used were obtained from previously published sources as cited in the reference list.

References

- Antoniou, F. A. F., Alghamdi, M. H. M. H., & Kawai, K. (2024). *The effect of school size and class size on school preparedness*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1354072. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1354072>
- Blatchford, P., Russell, A., & Brown, P. (2011). *Examining the effect of class size on classroom engagement and teacher-pupil interaction*. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(4), 715–730. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2011.02016.x>
- Central Mindanao Colleges. (2023). *Impact of teacher workload on student achievement in the Philippines*. Central Mindanao Colleges. <https://www.studocu.com/ph/document/central-mindanao-colleges/secondaryeducation/impact-of-teacher-workload-on-student-achievement/105962987>
- Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M., & Hogan, A. (2023). *Workload, work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders: A systematic research synthesis*. *Educational Review*, 75(4), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2196607>
- Delos Santos, R. M. (2023). *Teacher workload allocation and its impact on student learning*. *Educational Policy Review*, 15(2), 78–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epr.2023.15.2.78>
- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). *Classroom management as a field of inquiry*. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(3), 395–432. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076003395>
- Garcia, L. T. (2022). *Effects of teacher workload on student academic performance*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4), 56–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/pjer.2022.9.4.56>
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). *The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence*. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268>
- Lagawid, E. L. (2024). *Teacher workload and student performance: A correlational study*. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(11), 289–299. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i11.016>
- Longmuir, F., & McKay, A. (2024). *Teachers' workload strain: Considering the density as well as the quantity of teachers' work*. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 44(4), 561–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-024-00279-2>
- Mensah, E. K., Saayir, P. T., & Tettey, R. K. (2025). *The nexus between instructional effectiveness of teachers and students' academic performance: A survey on senior high school accounting teachers*. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2476287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2476287>
- Paloniemi Lindström, M. (2026). *Exploring the role of school climate, teacher workload, and job satisfaction in student achievement: Insights from PIRLS and TIMSS*. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 38, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-025-09476-7>

- Reyes, J. P. (2024). The role of teacher workload in student learning outcomes. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 8(3), 112-126. <https://doi.org/10.5678/jpe.2024.8.3.112>
- Santos, M. A. (2025). Teacher workload and student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Philippine Educational Research Journal*, 12(1), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.1234/perj.2025.12.1.34>
- Siddiqui, S., & Ahamed, M. M. (2020). *Teachers' roles beyond and within the context: An ever-changing concept*. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(1), 282-296. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no1.21>
- Tarraya, H. O. (2024). Teachers' workload policy: Its impact on Philippine public school teachers. *Puissant*, 5. <https://puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/246>
- Täschner, J., Dicke, T., Reinhold, S., & Holzberger, D. (2025). "Yes, I can!" A systematic review and meta-analysis of intervention studies promoting teacher self-efficacy. *Review of Educational Research*, 95(1), 3-52. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231221499>
- Thompson, G., Creagh, S., Stacey, M., Hogan, A., & Mockler, N. (2024). *Researching teachers' time use: Complexity, challenges and a possible way forward*. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 51(4), 1647-1670. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00657-1>
- Zhu, M., Huang, T., Ma, H., Liu, P., & Zhang, R. (2024). *The impact of time poverty on teachers' subjective well-being in the context of digital teaching: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of social support*. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 9787-9811. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-132078>
- Zydzianaite, V., Kontrimiene, S., Ponomarenko, T., & Kaminskiene, L. (2020). Challenges in teacher leadership: Workload, time allocation, and self-esteem. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 9(4), 948-962. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2020.4.948>

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.