

Work-Life Balance and Employee Performance Outcomes in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila

Dr. Jeffrey B. Villena

Graduate School Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11030074>

Received: 25 March 2026; Accepted: 31 March 2026; Published: 12 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between work-life balance and employee performance outcomes in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila, focusing on school administrators, faculty, and non-academic staff. Specifically, it analyzed how workload distribution, institutional support, and organizational practices influence employee well-being and performance, while identifying key workplace challenges. A mixed-methods research design was employed, integrating quantitative data from structured surveys ($n = 192$) and qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews.

Findings revealed that employees generally perceive work-life balance and employee performance outcomes as favorable, particularly in terms of workload manageability, resource adequacy, and task timeliness. However, qualitative results highlighted the presence of resilient professionalism, wherein employees maintain high levels of performance despite workload pressures, limited flexibility, and inconsistent supervisory support. Faculty members, in particular, reported greater exposure to role overload and work-life balance challenges.

Inferential analysis indicated a moderate, statistically significant positive relationship between work-life balance and employee performance outcomes ($r = 0.503$, $p < .0001$). Despite these positive perceptions, persistent challenges were identified, including excessive workload, limited scheduling flexibility, uneven supervisory support, and operational inefficiencies.

These findings suggest that performance outcomes are sustained through adaptive and compensatory mechanisms rather than optimal working conditions. Therefore, HEIs are encouraged to implement strategic interventions such as workload realignment, flexible work arrangements, strengthened supervisory practices, and institutionalized work-life balance policies to enhance employee well-being and sustain organizational performance.

Keywords: Work-life balance, employee performance outcomes, higher education institutions, employee well-being, organizational support

INTRODUCTION

The success of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) depends not only on academic excellence and institutional achievements but also on the work-life balance and employee performance outcomes of the personnel who drive them. In HEIs, faculty deliver instruction, conduct research, and engage in community partnerships, while non-academic staff manage essential support functions, including student services, information systems, and operational logistics. Together with school administrators, these employees sustain the daily operations and strategic advancement of universities and colleges.

Despite the centrality of human resources to institutional effectiveness, contemporary discussions often prioritize student outcomes, academic rankings, and research output, while overlooking the workplace conditions that shape employee experiences. Balanced workloads, supportive organizational practices, and employee well-being are essential not only for individual health and job satisfaction but also for institutional

performance. In the context of dynamic workplace demands, globalization pressures, and evolving roles in education, understanding the relationship between work-life balance and employee performance outcomes is increasingly critical in organizational and higher education research.

This study aims to examine how work-life balance influences employee performance outcomes among school administrators, faculty, and non-academic staff in HEIs in Metro Manila, while identifying key workplace challenges affecting both well-being and performance. In the Philippine context, HEIs play a vital role in national development by expanding access to quality education, preparing skilled graduates, and advancing research and innovation. Yet many institutions encounter challenges such as low morale, burnout, high turnover, and inconsistent performance outcomes—issues often rooted in inadequate attention to the workplace conditions affecting both academic and support personnel. By investigating work-life balance and its connection to performance outcomes, this study provides evidence-based insights to guide HEI leaders, policymakers, and human resource practitioners in designing healthier and more sustainable work environments. Enhancing work-life balance is not only a matter of employee welfare but also a strategic imperative that strengthens organizational performance, supports institutional sustainability, and contributes to national education development goals.

Despite extensive research on employee well-being, few studies have examined the combined influence of work-life balance and performance outcomes across multiple employee groups within Philippine HEIs, particularly using a mixed-methods approach. Metro Manila was selected as the study site because it serves as the country's primary educational hub, hosting a concentration of HEIs with diverse student populations, organizational structures, and workplace cultures. Insights from HEIs in Metro Manila provide a valuable basis for understanding broader trends, challenges, and best practices in Philippine higher education.

This study operationalizes work-life balance as a critical organizational condition influencing employee performance outcomes within the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) framework. SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2017; Chen et al., 2021) posits that individuals thrive when their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are supported. In organizational contexts, supportive practices that foster autonomy, provide meaningful resources, and encourage social connection enhance intrinsic motivation, engagement, and performance outcomes. In HEIs, work-life balance initiatives—including equitable workload distribution, flexible arrangements, supportive supervision, and access to institutional resources can strengthen employees' sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness, thereby positively influencing performance. Applying SDT, this study examines how the work-life balance experiences of school administrators, faculty, and non-academic staff relate to performance outcomes in HEIs in Metro Manila.

METHODOLOGY

The study on work-life balance and employee performance outcomes in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila employed a mixed-methods design, integrating quantitative surveys and qualitative semi-structured interviews to capture employees' perceptions comprehensively.

A total of 192 participants were purposively sampled from selected HEIs, including 28 school administrators, 103 faculty members, and 61 non-academic staff. Participants were grouped into three categories school administrators, faculty, and non-academic staff to facilitate subgroup comparisons. Purposive sampling was justified as it targeted information-rich participants relevant to the study objectives (Ahmad & Wilkins, 2025; Memon et al., 2025; Palinkas et al., 2015). While administrators were underrepresented relative to faculty, this reflects typical HEI workforce composition and is acknowledged as a limitation affecting subgroup balance. Future studies may adopt proportionate or quota sampling to improve representativeness.

Quantitative data were collected using structured surveys with closed-ended and Likert-scale items measuring workload, resources, administrative support, workplace relationships, professional growth, and performance outcomes (Creswell & Creswell, 2025). Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with faculty and non-academic staff, exploring workplace strengths, stressors, adaptability, and suggestions for improvement. Triangulation of survey and interview data enhanced the validity of the findings.

Positive response patterns may reflect ceiling effects or social desirability bias. Future studies could address this by expanding Likert scales, incorporating reverse-coded items, and including behaviorally specific indicators to capture subtle variations in work-life balance and performance outcomes (Conway & Lance, 2010; DeVellis, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. How do the School Administrators, Faculty and Non-Academic Staff assess the work-life balance in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila?

Table 1. Assessment of Work-Life Balance in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila

Indicators	School Administrators		Faculty		Non-Academic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Workload is distributed in a way that employees can accomplish tasks without excessive stress.	4.40	HE	4.80	HE	4.30	HE	4.50	HE	1
2. Employees have sufficient time to attend to personal and family responsibilities.	3.80	E	4.40	HE	3.50	E	3.90	E	5
3. Opportunities to take breaks, personal leave, or rest are consistently provided.	3.80	E	4.20	HE	4.08	E	4.03	E	3
4. Flexible working arrangements or schedules are available to support employee needs.	3.60	E	3.80	E	4.14	E	3.85	E	6
5. Employees are able to maintain a balance between work duties and personal life.	3.40	E	4.00	E	3.36	ME	3.59	E	8
6. Job responsibilities do not excessively interfere with employees' personal time.	4.00	E	3.00	ME	3.68	E	3.56	E	9
7. Supervisors and administrators actively provide support to manage work-related stress.	3.20	ME	4.40	HE	3.62	E	3.74	E	7
8. Adequate resources, tools, and assistance are available to complete tasks effectively.	4.00	E	4.00	E	4.20	HE	4.07	E	2
9. Employees have control or autonomy over scheduling and prioritizing their work.	4.00	E	4.00	E	3.86	E	3.95	E	4
10. Institutional policies and programs clearly promote and support a healthy work-life balance.	3.80	E	2.20	LE	3.28	ME	3.09	ME	10
Overall Mean	3.80	E	3.88	E	3.80	E	3.83	E	

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
5	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Evident	HE
4	3.40 – 4.19	Evident	E
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Evident	ME
2	1.80 – 2.59	Least Evident	LE
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Evident	NE

As presented in Table 1, the assessment of Work-Life Balance in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila reveals that the three groups of respondents School Administrators, Faculty, and Non-Academic Staff generally perceived the institution's work-life practices as favorable. The indicator "Workload is distributed in a way that employees can accomplish tasks without excessive stress" obtained the highest composite mean of 4.50, interpreted as Highly Evident (HE). This suggests that respondents across all employee groups generally agree that workload distribution supports task completion without undue stress.

The next highest-rated indicator, "Adequate resources, tools, and assistance are available to complete tasks effectively," garnered a composite mean of 4.07, interpreted as Evident (E). These findings demonstrate that while employees recognize the availability of resources to facilitate their work, there is room for improvement to fully optimize work processes. Similarly, "Opportunities to take breaks, personal leave, or rest are consistently provided" received a composite mean of 4.03 (E), reflecting a generally favorable perception of institutional support for rest and recuperation.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator, "Institutional policies and programs clearly promote and support a healthy work-life balance," obtained a composite mean of 3.09, interpreted as Moderately Evident (ME). This points to concerns regarding formal policies or programs explicitly supporting work-life balance, suggesting a need for clearer institutional frameworks or initiatives. Other indicators, such as "Employees are able to maintain a balance between work duties and personal life" and "Job responsibilities do not excessively interfere with employees' personal time," also received moderate scores, indicating that while some support exists, employees may still experience challenges in achieving consistent work-life balance.

Overall, work-life balance was assessed a composite mean of 3.83, interpreted as Evident (E). This indicates that while HEIs in Metro Manila provide several mechanisms that promote work-life balance, there is potential to strengthen institutional policies, flexible arrangements, and support systems to further enhance employee well-being. The findings underscore the importance of targeted interventions to improve work-life balance, which can, in turn, positively influence performance outcomes, employee satisfaction, and overall institutional effectiveness. This highlights a misalignment between operational practices and formal institutional frameworks, suggesting that work-life balance is informally enacted rather than systematically institutionalized.

The findings further suggest that while work-life balance practices are generally perceived as evident, the relatively lower ratings assigned to institutional policies indicate a structural gap between operational practices and formal organizational frameworks. This disparity implies that work-life balance in HEIs may be sustained through informal adaptive strategies rather than systematically reinforced through institutionalized policies. Such conditions may contribute to the emergence of resilient professionalism, where employees maintain performance despite underlying constraints.

These findings are supported by recent studies emphasizing the importance of work-life balance in organizational settings. Allen et al. (2021) highlighted that effective workload management and supportive work environments significantly reduce employee stress and improve well-being. Similarly, Deery & Jago (2022) found that organizational support systems, including flexible work arrangements and access to resources, play a crucial role in enhancing employee satisfaction and performance. In the context of higher education, García-González et al. (2023) reported that faculty and staff who experience balanced workloads and institutional support demonstrate higher levels of engagement and productivity. Moreover, Haar et al. (2014) emphasized that work-life balance practices, when consistently implemented, lead to improved job satisfaction and reduced burnout across different employee groups.

2. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the three groups of respondents of the Work-life Balance in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila?

Table 2. Test of Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Work-Life Balance Among School Administrators, Faculty and Non-Academic Staff in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila

Variable	Group	Mean	F-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Work-Life Balance	School Administrators	3.80	0.330	0.968	Fail to Reject H_o	Not Significant
	Faculty	3.88				
	Non-Academic Staff	3.80				

Note: ANOVA was used with $df = 2, 189$ at a 0.05 level of significance

As shown in Table 2, the assessment of Work-Life Balance among School Administrators (mean = 3.80), Faculty (mean = 3.88), and Non-Academic Staff (mean = 3.80) in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila yielded an F-value of 0.330 and a p-value of 0.968. Since the p-value exceeds the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is not rejected, indicating that there is no significant difference in the perception of work-life balance among the three groups of respondents.

The minimal differences in mean scores suggest a shared perception of work-life balance across all employee groups, with all means falling within the “Evident” range. This uniformity may reflect the consistent application of work-life balance practices and institutional support mechanisms across administrative, academic, and non-academic units. Such consistency indicates that policies related to workload distribution, access to resources, flexible arrangements, and managerial support are perceived similarly, regardless of job role.

Overall, these findings demonstrate that employees at different organizational levels experience comparable work-life balance conditions, suggesting that work-life balance perceptions are relatively consistent across employee groups, regardless of role that support employee well-being across all levels of the institution.

This aligns with recent studies highlighting the consistency of employee perceptions when organizational systems are uniformly implemented. Kossek & Lee (2022) emphasized that integrated work-life balance strategies create shared experiences among employees by standardizing access to flexibility and support across roles. Similarly, Fan et al (2023) found that when institutions adopt inclusive work-life policies, differences in employee perceptions across hierarchical levels tend to diminish. In the academic setting, Tremblay & Demers (2022) reported that faculty and administrative staff exhibit similar levels of work-life balance satisfaction when institutional policies are consistently enforced. Furthermore, Ojo et al (2023) highlighted that organizational equity in workload and support systems is associated with uniform perceptions of well-being, regardless of employees’ position or function.

3. How do the three groups of respondents assess the Employee Performance Outcomes in selected Higher Education Institutions in Manila?

Table 3. Assessment of Employee Performance Outcomes in Higher Education Institutions in Metro Manila

Indicators	School Administrators		Faculty		Non-Academic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Tasks and responsibilities are completed accurately and efficiently by employees.	4.00	E	4.40	HE	4.30	HE	4.23	HE	2.5
2. Work outputs consistently meet the institution’s quality	3.60	E	3.40	E	3.58	E	3.53	E	9

standards.									
3. Deadlines for reports, projects, and assignments are regularly met.	4.60	HE	4.20	HE	4.44	HE	4.41	HE	1
4. Employees demonstrate effective problem-solving and decision-making skills.	4.20	HE	3.40	E	3.96	E	3.85	E	6
5. Collaboration and teamwork among faculty and staff are evident.	3.60	E	4.20	HE	4.42	HE	4.07	E	5
6. Employees contribute ideas and innovations to improve work processes.	4.00	E	4.40	HE	4.30	HE	4.23	HE	2.5
7. Staff and faculty actively support the achievement of institutional goals.	3.20	ME	3.40	E	3.76	E	3.45	E	10
8. Monitoring and feedback mechanisms for performance are consistently implemented.	3.60	E	3.60	E	3.72	E	3.64	E	8
9. Employees maintain professionalism, ethical conduct, and accountability in all work activities.	4.00	E	4.00	E	4.34	HE	4.11	E	4
10. Institutional outcomes, such as student satisfaction, program completion rates, and service efficiency, reflect the quality of employee performance.	3.60	E	3.20	ME	4.16	E	3.65	E	7
Overall Mean	3.84	E	3.82	E	4.10	E	3.92	E	

As presented in Table 3, the assessment of Employee Performance Outcomes in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila reveals that the three groups of respondents School Administrators, Faculty, and Non-Academic Staff generally perceived employee performance as favorable. The indicator “Deadlines for reports, projects, and assignments are regularly met” obtained the highest composite mean of 4.41, interpreted as Highly Evident (HE). This demonstrates that employees consistently demonstrate timeliness and efficiency in completing assigned tasks, reflecting a strong commitment to meeting institutional expectations.

The next highest-rated indicators, “Tasks and responsibilities are completed accurately and efficiently by employees” and “Employees contribute ideas and innovations to improve work processes,” both garnered a composite mean of 4.23, interpreted as Highly Evident (HE). These findings suggest that employees not only perform their duties effectively but also actively engage in innovation and continuous improvement. Additionally, “Employees maintain professionalism, ethical conduct, and accountability in all work activities” received a composite mean of 4.11, interpreted as Evident (E), indicating that ethical standards and accountability are consistently observed across the institution.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator, “Staff and faculty actively support the achievement of institutional goals,” obtained a composite mean of 3.45, interpreted as Evident (E). This suggests that while employees contribute to institutional objectives, there may be varying levels of engagement or alignment with

organizational goals. Similarly, “Work outputs consistently meet the institution’s quality standards” received a composite mean of 3.53 (E), indicating that although quality standards are generally met, there is still room for improvement in ensuring consistent excellence across all outputs. Other indicators, such as monitoring and feedback mechanisms and institutional outcomes, also received moderate ratings, reflecting opportunities to further strengthen performance management systems.

Overall, performance outcomes yielded a composite mean of 3.92 (Evident), indicating that employees in HEIs in Metro Manila demonstrate a satisfactory level of performance in terms of efficiency, quality of work, collaboration, and professionalism. However, the findings also highlight the need to enhance institutional strategies related to performance monitoring, alignment with organizational goals, and continuous quality improvement. Strengthening these areas can further elevate employee performance and contribute to improved institutional effectiveness and service delivery.

Consistent with prior studies emphasizing the role of organizational practices in shaping performance outcomes. Campbell & Wiernik (2021) emphasized that employee performance is strongly influenced by task proficiency, adaptability, and contextual behaviors such as teamwork and initiative. Similarly, Pulakos et al. (2022) highlighted that timely feedback, performance monitoring, and clear expectations are critical in sustaining high levels of employee performance. In the context of higher education, Shin & Jung (2023) found that faculty and staff performance improve when institutions promote collaboration, innovation, and accountability. Furthermore, Budhwar et al. (2022) noted that employee engagement and alignment with organizational goals are essential drivers of sustained performance and institutional success.

4. Is there a significant relationship between the work-life balance and employee performance outcomes?

Table 4. Test of Significant Relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Employee Performance Outcomes

Variables	r-value	Strength of Relationship	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Work-Life Balance and Employee Performance Outcomes	0.503	Moderate Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_o	Significant

Note: The statistical test used was the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. If the p-value is less than the level of significance, reject the null hypothesis(H_o). Otherwise, fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_o).

Legend:

Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
0.80 – 0.99	Very High Correlation	VHC
0.60 – 0.79	High Correlation	HC
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate Correlation	MC
0.10 – 0.39	Low Correlation	LC
0.01 – 0.09	Negligible Correlation	NC

As presented in Table 4, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient yielded an r-value of 0.503, indicating a moderate positive relationship between work-life balance and employee performance outcomes. This suggests that improvements in work-life balance such as manageable workloads, flexible work arrangements, and sufficient time for personal responsibilities are associated with corresponding improvements in employee performance outcomes, including productivity, efficiency, and quality of work.

The computed p-value of less than .0001 is significantly lower than the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and employee performance outcomes. However, the correlational nature of the analysis precludes causal inference, and the findings should be interpreted as indicative of association rather than direct causation.

This finding underscores the critical role of work-life balance as a determinant of employee performance in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Employees who are able to effectively manage their professional and personal responsibilities are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of engagement, motivation, and overall effectiveness in their roles.

This evidence aligns with recent studies. A study by Ariasari & Tjahjono (2024) found that work-life balance is a critical factor in enhancing employee satisfaction and engagement, which directly contributes to improved organizational performance. Similarly, Inegbedion (2024) reported that work-life balance significantly influences employee commitment, which in turn affects performance and organizational outcomes. In the context of higher education, Pateña (2024) emphasized that work-life balance among faculty and staff is closely linked to productivity and institutional effectiveness, particularly when supported by appropriate organizational frameworks.

Furthermore, recent empirical research by Salleh & Abas (2025) confirmed a positive relationship between work-life balance and perceived job performance among employees, reinforcing the idea that balanced work conditions enhance productivity and efficiency. In addition, Maraqa et al. (2025) highlighted that work-life balance plays a significant role in overall organizational effectiveness, further supporting its impact on performance outcomes across different sectors.

The findings present a notable analytical tension: while respondents rated work-life balance and performance outcomes as generally evident to highly evident, they simultaneously reported persistent challenges such as excessive workload, limited flexibility, and inconsistent supervisory support.

This study introduces the concept of resilient professionalism, defined as a compensatory behavioral pattern in which employees sustain high performance outcomes despite structurally constrained work environments through adaptive coping mechanisms and professional commitment.

This study contributes to the literature by introducing the concept of resilient professionalism, which explains how employees sustain performance under suboptimal institutional conditions. This extends Self-Determination Theory by demonstrating that partial psychological need satisfaction may sustain short-term performance but risks long-term well-being.

Anchored in Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the study suggests that employees generally experience high competence, reflected in strong performance outcomes, while autonomy is constrained due to workload pressures and limited flexibility. Relatedness, however, varies across individuals, depending on the consistency of supervisory support, highlighting uneven social and organizational connections within the workplace.

This imbalance implies that performance sustainability is effort-dependent rather than system-supported, raising concerns about long-term employee well-being, burnout risk, and organizational resilience.

5. What are the problems encountered relative to the work-life balance and performance outcomes?

Table 5. Assessment of Problems Encountered Relative to the Work-Life Balance and Performance Outcomes

Indicators	School Administrators		Faculty		Non-Academic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Difficulties arise in problem-solving and decision-making processes.	2.60	ME	2.80	ME	3.24	ME	2.88	ME	9
2. Opportunities for breaks, personal leave, or rest are insufficient or inconsistently provided.	2.60	ME	3.80	E	3.00	ME	3.13	ME	6
3. Supervisory and administrative support in managing work-related	2.40	LE	3.20	ME	3.14	ME	2.91	ME	8

stress is limited or delayed.									
4. Errors and inefficiencies occur in the completion of tasks and responsibilities.	2.40	LE	3.80	E	3.30	ME	3.17	ME	5
5. Work demands limit the time available for personal and family responsibilities.	2.80	ME	4.00	E	3.24	ME	3.35	ME	2
6. Work outputs fall below the expected quality standards of the institution.	2.20	LE	4.20	HE	3.12	ME	3.17	ME	4
7. Collaboration and teamwork among faculty and staff are inconsistent or ineffective.	2.20	LE	3.20	ME	3.00	ME	2.80	ME	10
8. Workload distribution leads to excessive stress and difficulty in completing tasks within required timelines.	2.60	ME	4.20	HE	3.38	ME	3.39	ME	1
9. Delays occur in meeting deadlines for reports, projects, and assignments.	2.80	ME	3.80	E	3.34	ME	3.31	ME	3
10. Flexible working arrangements or schedules are inadequate to address employee needs.	2.60	ME	3.60	E	2.96	ME	3.05	ME	7
Overall Mean	2.52	LE	3.66	E	3.17	ME	3.12	ME	

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
5	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Encountered	HE
4	3.40 – 4.19	Encountered	E
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Encountered	ME
2	1.80 – 2.59	Least Encountered	LE
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Encountered	NE

As presented in Table 5, the assessment of problems encountered relative to Work-Life Balance and Performance Outcomes in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila reveals that the three groups of respondents School Administrators, Faculty, and Non-Academic Staff generally experienced these issues to a moderate extent. The overall composite mean of 3.12, interpreted as Moderately Encountered (ME), indicates that while the identified problems are not severe, they are consistently present and may influence employee well-being and performance outcomes.

The most prominent problem, ranked first, is “Workload distribution is linked to excessive stress and difficulty in completing tasks within required timelines,” with a composite mean of 3.39 (ME). This highlights that workload pressure remains a primary concern and contributes to stress, reduced efficiency, and challenges in maintaining work-life balance. Closely following is “Work demands limit the time available for personal and family responsibilities,” ranked second with a composite mean of 3.35 (ME), indicating difficulty in balancing professional and personal obligations.

The third-ranked problem, “Delays occur in meeting deadlines for reports, projects, and assignments,” obtained a composite mean of 3.31 (ME), reflecting the impact of workload and time constraints on timely task completion. “Work outputs fall below expected quality standards” and “Errors and inefficiencies in task

completion” ranked fourth and fifth (3.17, ME), suggesting that performance outcomes are affected by workload pressures and limited support mechanisms.

Mid-level concerns include “Opportunities for breaks, personal leave, or rest are insufficient or inconsistently provided” (3.13, ME) and “Flexible working arrangements or schedules are inadequate to address employee needs” (3.05, ME). These findings indicate that while some support mechanisms exist, improvements are needed to enhance employee well-being and workplace flexibility.

The least encountered problems include “Supervisory and administrative support in managing work-related stress is limited or delayed” (2.91, ME), “Difficulties in problem-solving and decision-making” (2.88, ME), and “Collaboration and teamwork among faculty and staff are inconsistent or ineffective” (2.80, ME). Although less frequent, these issues require attention to strengthen organizational effectiveness and teamwork.

Group-level analysis shows that Faculty (3.66, Encountered) reported higher levels of problems compared to Non-Academic Staff (3.17, ME) and School Administrators (2.52, LE), indicating that faculty experience greater exposure to workload pressures and performance demands. This reinforces that while problems are generally moderate across groups, faculty members experience these issues at a comparatively higher intensity.

Overall, the findings indicate that problems in HEIs in Metro Manila are largely associated with workload, time constraints, and performance outcomes. Their consistent presence underscores the need for targeted interventions in workload management, flexible work arrangements, and performance support systems to improve employee well-being, enhance productivity, and strengthen institutional effectiveness.

Interview Results

The interviews with selected school administrators, faculty members, and non-academic staff provided rich qualitative insights into work-life balance and performance outcomes in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila. Participants consistently emphasized that employees demonstrate strong commitment to their roles, particularly in meeting deadlines, completing assigned tasks, and maintaining professionalism. Faculty members described themselves as “dedicated to fulfilling teaching and administrative responsibilities despite heavy workloads,” while non-academic staff shared that they “ensure that assigned tasks and services are delivered efficiently.” These responses indicate that employees possess the necessary competencies and work ethic to sustain acceptable levels of performance. These observations reinforce prior studies highlighting that employee competence, accountability, and teamwork are critical factors in sustaining organizational performance and productivity (Campbell & Wiernik, 2021; Shin & Jung, 2023).

Despite these strengths, respondents identified several challenges that affect both work-life balance and performance. A major concern raised was excessive workload and time constraints, with faculty reporting overlapping responsibilities in teaching, research, and administrative functions, while non-academic staff highlighted multiple task assignments due to limited personnel. One respondent noted, “Work responsibilities often extend beyond regular hours, leaving limited time for personal and family life.” This reflects how workload pressures interfere with employees’ ability to maintain balance and sustain productivity. This finding aligns with studies indicating that excessive workload and role overload significantly contribute to stress, burnout, and reduced job performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Molino et al., 2023).

Another concern involves limited opportunities for rest and flexible work arrangements. Participants expressed that breaks, leave opportunities, and flexible schedules are sometimes insufficient to meet their personal needs. As shared by one employee, “Balancing work and personal responsibilities becomes difficult when schedules are fixed and workload is heavy.” This implies institutional mechanisms for supporting work-life balance require further strengthening. This observation is supported by research showing that flexible work arrangements and adequate recovery time are essential in promoting employee well-being and enhancing performance outcomes (Kossek & Perrigino, 2022; Fan et al., 2023).

Issues related to supervisory support and communication were also highlighted. Some respondents noted that support from administrators in managing work-related stress varies across departments, while others

mentioned delays in guidance and feedback. A participant stated, “Support from supervisors is present, but response time and consistency can still be improved.” These concerns suggest that leadership practices influence employees’ ability to manage stress and perform effectively. Similar findings were reported by studies emphasizing that supportive leadership and effective communication significantly enhance employee engagement, reduce stress, and improve organizational performance (Inceoglu et al., 2022; Nguyen et al., 2023).

In terms of performance outcomes, respondents acknowledged that delays, inefficiencies, and quality issues occasionally occur, particularly during periods of high workload. Faculty and staff noted that time pressure and overlapping responsibilities sometimes affect the quality and timeliness of outputs. However, they also emphasized that teamwork and collaboration help mitigate these challenges, allowing employees to meet institutional expectations. These findings are consistent with research indicating that workload pressure negatively affects performance quality, while collaborative work environments help sustain productivity and efficiency (Pulakos et al., 2022; Budhwar et al., 2022).

Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis of the interview data revealed four overarching themes that explain the relationship between work-life balance and employee performance outcomes.

1. **Commitment to Performance and Professional Responsibility.** Employees across all groups demonstrated a strong sense of responsibility in completing tasks, meeting deadlines, and maintaining professionalism. This commitment supports consistent performance outcomes despite existing challenges.
2. **Workload Pressure and Time Constraints.** Participants identified excessive workload and competing responsibilities as major barriers to achieving work-life balance. These pressures often extend working hours and reduce time for personal and family life, affecting both well-being and performance.
3. **Limitations in Work-Life Balance Support Systems.** Respondents highlighted insufficient opportunities for rest, limited flexibility in work arrangements, and varying levels of supervisory support. These factors indicate gaps in institutional practices that are intended to promote work-life balance.
4. **Impact of Work-Life Conditions on Performance Outcomes.** The findings reveal that work-life balance conditions directly influence performance. Heavy workload, limited flexibility, and insufficient support contribute to delays, inefficiencies, and occasional declines in work quality, while collaboration and teamwork help sustain productivity.

Overall, the interview findings complement the quantitative results by showing that while employees in HEIs demonstrate competence, commitment, and professionalism, their performance outcomes are influenced by workload demands, time limitations, and institutional support systems. Addressing these concerns through improved workload management, flexible work arrangements, and stronger support mechanisms can enhance both employee well-being and institutional performance.

This study acknowledges several limitations that may affect the interpretation and generalizability of findings. First, the disproportionate sample distribution, with faculty comprising the majority of respondents, may skew the results toward the academic perspective and limit the depth of insights specific to school administrators. Although this reflects the actual workforce composition of HEIs, subgroup comparisons should be interpreted with caution. Second, the use of self-reported survey instruments introduces the possibility of social desirability bias, wherein respondents may provide favorable assessments of work-life balance and performance outcomes to align with professional expectations. Third, the study does not explicitly distinguish between public and private HEIs, which may differ significantly in terms of workload structures, institutional resources, and policy implementation. This limits contextual generalizability. Finally, the cross-sectional design captures perceptions at a single point in time and does not account for fluctuations across academic cycles (e.g., peak vs. non-peak periods).

CONCLUSIONS

The findings indicate that employees in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Metro Manila generally demonstrate favorable levels of work-life balance and employee performance outcomes. However, these outcomes coexist with persistent structural challenges, including excessive workload, limited flexibility, and inconsistent supervisory support.

The study demonstrates that performance sustainability is driven more by employee resilience and adaptive behaviors than by structurally supportive systems, raising critical concerns about long-term well-being and institutional sustainability.

The significant relationship between work-life balance and performance outcomes reinforces the importance of organizational support mechanisms in sustaining employee effectiveness. From a theoretical perspective, the findings extend Self-Determination Theory by demonstrating how partial satisfaction of psychological needs can sustain performance in the short term but may undermine long-term well-being and organizational sustainability.

Overall, the findings suggest that sustained performance in HEIs is driven more by employee resilience than by structurally supportive systems, raising critical concerns about long-term employee well-being and institutional sustainability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed to enhance work-life balance and employee performance outcomes in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs):

1. HEIs may conduct systematic workload assessments and implement transparent workload allocation models that equitably distribute teaching, research, administrative responsibilities, and “invisible labor” (e.g., mentoring, committee work, and student support). Clear role delineation, task prioritization, and periodic workload audits may help mitigate role overload, enhance accountability, and promote sustainable performance outcomes.
2. Institutions are encouraged to adopt structured and policy-driven flexible work arrangements, including hybrid work models, telecommuting options, and output-based performance systems. These mechanisms may enable employees to better manage professional and personal responsibilities, thereby improving work-life balance and reducing burnout.
3. Administrators and supervisors may strengthen their capacity to provide timely guidance, consistent feedback, and proactive support through leadership development programs. Training initiatives focusing on supportive supervision, emotional intelligence, communication, and stress management may enhance managerial effectiveness and foster a more responsive organizational climate.
4. Ensuring the availability of adequate equipment, digital infrastructure, and institutional resources may facilitate efficient task completion and minimize operational inefficiencies. Strategic investments in technology and support systems may improve both individual productivity and overall organizational performance.
5. HEIs may develop and institutionalize comprehensive policies that explicitly promote work-life balance. These may include clear guidelines on leave entitlements, rest periods, flexible work arrangements, and employee wellness programs. Effective dissemination and communication of these policies are essential to ensure accessibility and utilization across all employee groups.
6. Institutions may establish formal digital work boundaries, including guidelines on after-hours communication, email response expectations, and the “right to disconnect.” Such measures may reduce techno-overload, prevent work encroachment into personal time, and support employees’ psychological well-being.

7. Opportunities for continuous learning, skills development, and team-building activities may be strengthened to promote collaboration, innovation, and knowledge sharing. These initiatives may reinforce employee performance outcomes while cultivating a supportive and cohesive organizational culture.
8. HEIs may establish systematic mechanisms for ongoing assessment, such as employee satisfaction surveys, workload audits, and performance evaluations. Continuous monitoring and feedback loops may enable institutions to identify emerging challenges, evaluate intervention effectiveness, and implement timely policy and practice adjustments.
9. HEIs may integrate work-life balance indicators into institutional performance management systems to ensure that employee well-being is systematically monitored alongside productivity and performance metrics.
10. Future studies may examine the long-term effects of work-life balance interventions on employee performance outcomes using longitudinal designs. Comparative research across public and private HEIs, as well as across geographical regions, is recommended to capture institutional variability. Further investigation into individual-level variables such as resilience, coping strategies, and personality traits may provide deeper insights into moderating factors. Additionally, studies may explore differences across academic disciplines, employment categories, and organizational structures to inform more targeted and context-specific interventions.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, T. D., Merlo, K., Lawrence, R. C., Slutsky, J., & Gray, C. E. (2021). Boundary management and work–nonwork balance while working from home. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 60–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12300>
2. Ariasari, N. W., & Tjahjono, H. K. (2024). Work–life balance, organizational commitment, and employee performance: Evidence from the education sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 73(2), 389–405. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2022-0267>
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
4. Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. (2009). Making the link between work–life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.09.001>
5. Brough, P., Timms, C., O’Driscoll, M. P., Kalliath, T., Siu, O. L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2014). Work–life balance: A longitudinal evaluation of a new measure across Australia and New Zealand workers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(19), 2724–2744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.878047>
6. Budhwar, P., Malik, A., De Silva, M. T., & Saini, D. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence–challenged human resource management practices and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100868. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100868>
7. Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2021). The modeling and assessment of work performance: Building theory, improving measurement, and enhancing impact. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 8, 147–172. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055244>
8. Chen, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Beyers, W., Boone, L., Deci, E. L., Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2021). Basic psychological need satisfaction, need frustration, and need strength across four cultures. *Motivation and Emotion*, 45, 351–365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-021-09869-4>
9. Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9181-6>

10. De Guzman, M. T., Santos, M. A. P., & Lorenzo, J. A. (2022). Lived experiences of work–life balance among academic leaders in Philippine higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23(1), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09704-9>
11. Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2022). Revisiting talent management, work–life balance, and retention strategies in service industries. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 34(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2020-1206>
12. DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
13. Fan, X., Liu, Y., Wang, M., & Wang, L. (2023). The impact of work–life balance on employee productivity: The moderating role of organizational support. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3210. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043210>
14. García-González, J., Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Bañón-Gomis, A. J. (2023). Work–life balance and engagement outcomes in employees: Exploring the role of organizational support. *Journal of Business Research*, 154, 113455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113455>
15. Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Sune, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work–life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85, 361–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.08.010>
16. Inceoglu, I., Segers, J., & Bartram, T. (2022). Leadership behaviors and employee well-being in the context of organizational change. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(2), 200–216. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000304>
17. Inegbedion, H. (2024). Work–life balance and employee performance in emerging economies: The role of institutional support. *Employee Relations*, 46(1), 120–137. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2023-0125>
18. Jackson, L. T., & Fransman, E. I. (2013). Employee work–life balance outcomes: The role of supervisory support and organizational support. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(6), 1257–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.709208>
19. Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., & Tranby, E. (2010). Changing workplaces to reduce work–family conflict: Schedule control in a white-collar organization. *American Sociological Review*, 75(2), 265–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411400056>
20. Kossek, E. E., & Perrigino, M. B. (2022). Resilience and work–life balance in the new world of work: Implications for human resource management. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091249>
21. Maraqa, M., Alshawabkeh, K., & Al-Faouri, R. (2025). Work–life balance and organizational performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. *Management Research Review*, 48(2), 210–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-11-2024-0897>
22. Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2023). Well-being costs of technology use during remote working: An investigation using the job demands–resources model. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, 113476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113476>
23. Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, Q. H., & Pham, T. T. (2023). Work–life balance and job performance among academic staff: The mediating role of work engagement. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 24(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09745-6>
24. Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
25. Pateña, A. B. (2024). Work–life balance and teaching performance among higher education faculty in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 55–72.
26. Pulakos, E. D., Hanson, R. M., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2022). Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential approach for complex behavior change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 15, 455–472. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.33>
27. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.

28. Salleh, M. R., & Abas, M. K. (2025). Work–life balance practices and employee productivity in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 63(1), 88–104. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2024-0187>
29. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
30. Shin, Y., & Jung, J. (2023). Work–life balance and employee well-being in organizational contexts: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2654>
31. Siem Tran Thi, S., Ho Thi Thao Nguyen, H. T., & Phan Tan Luc, P. (2025). Work–life balance in higher education: A review based on bibliographic coupling analysis. *Acta Psychologica*, 260, 105567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105567>
32. Znidarsic, J., & Maric, M. (2021). Relationships between work–family balance, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and work engagement among higher education lecturers. *Organizacija*, 54(3), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2021-0015>