



# Work Overload, Job Stress, and Job Performance Among Non-Teaching Employees of President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Philippines

April C. Imperial<sup>1</sup>, \*Santi A. Magtalas<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Graduate Student, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales)

<sup>2</sup>(Graduate School Lecturer, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales)

Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1306000079>

Received: 24 May 2026; Accepted: 29 May 2026; Published: 23 June 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated the factors influencing work overload, job stress, and job performance among non-teaching personnel of President Ramon Magsaysay State University (PRMSU) using a descriptive-correlational design. It examined employee profiles alongside their level of workload, stress, and performance. Most respondents were female Administrative Aides with bachelor's degrees and an average of nine years in service, reporting very satisfactory performance. They agreed on the presence of work overload, role conflict, unfulfilled commitment, and stress—mainly from time pressure and workload—while disagreeing on experiencing burnout. Significant differences in work overload, stress, and performance emerged based on educational attainment, assignment location, and position. A strong positive correlation was found between work overload and job stress, while a moderate negative correlation was observed between work overload and performance. Employees in central campuses and those with higher qualifications reported more institutional pressure, impacting well-being and commitment. Despite challenges, contextual performance remained high, and counterproductive behaviors were minimal. The study highlights the need for job clarity, institutional support, and fair resource distribution. An intervention plan was proposed focusing on workload management, stress reduction, and performance support. Administrators are encouraged to adopt this framework and monitor related indicators regularly. Further research is recommended to validate and expand these findings for informed policy-making in higher education.

**Keywords** – Work Overload, Job Stress, Job Performance, Non-teaching personnel, Public Higher Education Institution

## INTRODUCTION

Work overload and job stress are increasingly recognized as major factors affecting employee well-being and organizational performance. Globally, workplace demands have intensified due to digital transformation, heightened accountability, and post-pandemic operational adjustments, leading to elevated stress levels and reduced productivity across sectors (Ozamiz-Etxebarria et al., 2023; Wahab et al., 2024). In higher education, research has predominantly focused on faculty, documenting how increased teaching loads, research expectations, and accreditation duties contribute to burnout and diminished job performance (Pakdee et al., 2025). Despite their critical operational role, non-teaching personnel—responsible for administrative, financial, student service, and compliance functions—remain underrepresented in research, leaving a gap in understanding how workload and stress affect their performance and well-being.

Global studies often aggregate non-teaching staff with other “support personnel,” masking the unique pressures they face, including role conflict, unfulfilled commitments, and limited career mobility (Wahab et al., 2024). Few investigations integrate work overload, job stress, and job performance within a single analytical



framework, particularly in public higher education contexts. This limits evidence-based interventions aimed at improving institutional efficiency while safeguarding employee health.

In developing countries, including the Philippines, these challenges are amplified by resource constraints, staffing shortages, and complex regulatory requirements. Public universities often require administrative personnel to perform multiple roles simultaneously, increasing work overload and role strain (Pakdee et al., 2025). While Philippine studies have examined stress and workload among teachers (Magtalas & Eduvala, 2024), research focusing on non-teaching staff in higher education remains limited and descriptive, with insufficient analysis of the relationships among workload, stress, and job performance. Contextual variables such as place of assignment, position, and educational attainment—which may moderate workload and stress experiences—are rarely considered.

At President Ramon Magsaysay State University, non-teaching personnel are integral to sustaining operations across multi-campus units. Their responsibilities have expanded with institutional growth, including tasks related to documentation, compliance, coordination, and administrative continuity. Although these employees often maintain satisfactory performance ratings, they report experiencing work overload, role conflict, and time pressures, which may compromise long-term performance and well-being (Aragon et al., 2024). Yet systematic studies linking these psychosocial factors to job performance in this group are scarce, constraining the University's capacity to implement targeted interventions.

This study addresses these gaps by examining work overload, job stress, and job performance among non-teaching personnel at PRMSU, situating the inquiry within both global and local contexts. By integrating demographic and organizational variables, it aims to identify how workload and stress affect performance outcomes and to provide evidence-based recommendations for workload management, stress reduction, and performance enhancement. The findings are expected to contribute to both scholarly literature and practical institutional strategies, ensuring that non-teaching personnel are adequately supported in sustaining the University's operational effectiveness.

## METHODS

The study employed a descriptive-correlational design to examine the factors influencing work overload, job stress, and job performance among non-teaching employees at President Ramon Magsaysay State University across its seven (7) campuses. The 131 regular (plantilla) non-teaching personnel were identified using stratified random sampling. Prior to participation, all respondents were provided with an informed consent form clearly stating the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks, benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Participation was strictly voluntary. To ensure data confidentiality, all responses were treated with the utmost privacy, and data were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the researchers. Results were presented in aggregate form to prevent identification of individual participants.

To develop the survey questionnaire, the researchers reviewed relevant literature to identify appropriate items and indicators. The questionnaire consisted of five parts: (1) respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, place of assignment, current position, and years in service; (2) Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) for the School Year 2024 rating; (3) work overload in terms of work overload, role conflict, and unfulfilled commitment; (4) job stress in terms of time pressure, work stress, and burnout; and (5) job performance in terms of task performance, contextual performance (organizational citizenship behavior), and counterproductive work behavior (CWB).

The instrument was developed based on the studies of Mittal and Bhakar (2018), and Koopmans, Bernaards, Hildebrandt, De Vet, and Van der Beek (2014). To ensure its validity and reliability, the instrument underwent expert validation and was pilot tested on a separate group of respondents not involved in the main study. The developed instrument was also subjected to Cronbach's Alpha analysis, and the results confirmed its reliability for administration to the target participants. Data collected from the respondents were tallied and analyzed using statistical tools such as percentage, weighted mean, ranking, ANOVA, Pearson-r, and Likert Scale.

## DISCUSSION

### Non-Teaching Respondents' Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR)

Table 1 presents the weighted mean scores for the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) of non-teaching personnel across two evaluation periods. For July to December 2023, the computed weighted mean was 4.33, interpreted as Very Satisfactory. For January to June 2024, the weighted mean slightly increased to 4.35, maintaining the Very Satisfactory rating. The overall weighted mean for both periods was 4.34, indicating a consistent and sustained level of performance among the 131 respondents.

Table 1. Weighted Mean and Interpretation of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Individual Performance Commitment and Review

Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Result	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Result for July to December 2023	4.33	Very Satisfactory
Result for January to June 2024	4.35	Very Satisfactory
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory</b>

This overall rating demonstrates that non-teaching personnel at the institution consistently meet or exceed performance expectations, reflecting a strong commitment to delivering quality administrative and support services. The sustained Very Satisfactory performance may be attributed to clear role definitions, structured accountability mechanisms, and ongoing professional development initiatives that enhance employee competency and motivation. These findings align with previous studies in the Philippine higher education context, which reported that non-teaching staff maintain high performance levels when institutional policies provide clear performance standards, opportunities for skills development, and structured monitoring systems (Evangelista & Madrid, 2021; Magtalas & Eduvala, 2024).

The results suggest that effective administrative support and adherence to performance management frameworks are instrumental in sustaining employee productivity. Additionally, the minor increase from 4.33 to 4.35 between periods indicates incremental improvements in work efficiency, possibly reflecting enhanced familiarity with institutional procedures or the cumulative effect of professional development interventions. Overall, the findings underscore the importance of continuing performance assessment, capacity-building programs, and recognition mechanisms to sustain and further improve non-teaching staff contributions, thereby supporting institutional goals and operational excellence.

### Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain

#### Work Overload

Table 2 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of non-teaching personnel's perceived work overload under the broader construct of role strain. Among the indicators, the statement "There are too many demands on my time" obtained the highest mean of 2.75, ranking first. This was followed by "My workload sometimes feels overwhelming and unmanageable" (M = 2.66, rank 2) and "I feel the need for extra hours in the day to meet work expectations" (M = 2.65, rank 3). The lowest-ranked item was "I often have tasks I don't have the time or energy to complete" (M = 2.53, rank 5). The overall weighted mean for work overload was 2.64, corresponding to the descriptive interpretation of Agree, indicating that non-teaching personnel generally perceive a moderate level of workload pressure.

Table 2. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain in Terms of Work Overload

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
There are too many demands on my time.	2.75	Agree	1
I struggle to find time for myself due to my workload.	2.61	Agree	4
I often have tasks I don’t have the time or energy to complete.	2.53	Agree	5
I feel the need for extra hours in the day to meet work expectations.	2.65	Agree	3
My workload sometimes feels overwhelming and unmanageable.	2.66	Agree	2
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

This pattern reflects the reality of administrative work in higher education, where support staff frequently juggle multiple responsibilities amid limited human resources and expanding institutional demands. Competing tasks, time pressures, and role multiplicity contribute to a sustained perception of work overload, which may lead to role strain and negatively influence work-life balance if unaddressed. Time-related stress has been identified in recent research as a particularly salient dimension of workload perception, especially when employees are required to meet concurrent deadlines without adequate resources (Lo & Jang, 2023; Haque et al., 2024).

Empirical evidence from service and administrative sectors further supports this interpretation. For example, Khan and Najmi (2021) found that administrative support staff in higher education reported significant workload pressures associated with task complexity and limited staffing, which were linked to lower job satisfaction and increased perceived stress. Similarly, Rahman, Salleh, and Karim (2023) reported that organizational support moderates the relationship between workload and stress among non-teaching staff, underscoring the role of institutional support systems in mitigating the adverse effects of work overload.

In the Philippine context, recent studies have highlighted how non-teaching personnel in educational institutions face persistent workload challenges. Velez and Estrella (2024) documented that non-teaching staff in Filipino universities experience high job demands coupled with inadequate job resources, leading to moderate levels of stress and perceptions of overload. Likewise, Uy and Cortez (2023) found that role ambiguity and overlapping duties among administrative employees were significantly associated with increased job strain and reduced operational productivity.

Overall, while non-teaching personnel at PRMSU demonstrate satisfactory performance, the moderate perception of work overload identified in this study suggests the need for continuous monitoring and proactive institutional interventions. Enhancing role clarity, improving workload distribution, and strengthening administrative support mechanisms may help mitigate potential negative consequences of role strain, improve job satisfaction, and sustain institutional efficiency.

### Role Conflict

Table 3 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents for non-teaching personnel’s perceived Role Conflict, a dimension of work overload and role strain. The statement “I have to prioritize tasks carefully to manage my responsibilities” obtained the highest mean of 3.24, indicating the strongest agreement and reflecting the frequent need for administrative staff to make difficult decisions about task sequencing. This was followed by “I feel pressured to complete tasks quickly, sometimes sacrificing quality” (M = 2.61, rank 2) and “I receive conflicting instructions or expectations from different supervisors” (M = 2.59, rank 3). The lowest mean was observed for the statement “No matter how much I do, I always feel behind in my work” (M = 2.46), which fell into the Disagree category. The overall weighted mean of 2.69 suggests that non-teaching personnel generally agree that role conflict is present in their work environment.

Table 3. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain in Terms of Role Conflict

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I frequently struggle to meet everyone’s expectations at work.	2.56	Agree	4
I have to prioritize tasks carefully to manage my responsibilities.	3.24	Agree	1
No matter how much I do, I always feel behind in my work.	2.46	Disagree	5
I feel pressured to complete tasks quickly, sometimes sacrificing quality.	2.61	Agree	2
I receive conflicting instructions or expectations from different supervisors.	2.59	Agree	3
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

Role conflict typically arises when employees receive incompatible demands, experience unclear expectations from multiple sources of authority, or lack sufficient autonomy in task execution. This can lead to increased psychological strain, stress, and compromised performance (Alarcon & Edwards, 2022). The highest-ranking item in this study—prioritizing tasks to manage responsibilities—suggests that non-teaching personnel must constantly navigate competing demands, which may heighten cognitive load and subjective stress.

Recent research has underscored the detrimental effects of role conflict on employee outcomes. Lo and Jang (2023) found that employees experiencing higher role ambiguity and conflict reported elevated job stress and reduced job satisfaction, particularly in environments with overlapping responsibilities. Similarly, Haque et al. (2024) reported that role conflict among administrative staff is significantly associated with psychological strain, especially when organizational resources and support are insufficient.

In the context of higher education, Rahman, Salleh, and Karim (2023) demonstrated that ambiguous expectations and inconsistent supervisory directives are key predictors of role conflict and stress among support staff, which in turn erode performance quality. Likewise, Khan and Najmi (2021) highlighted that non-teaching staff in universities often report moderate to high levels of role conflict due to unclear role boundaries and conflicting instructions from multiple administrators, which contributes to feelings of tension and overload.

The overall moderate agreement observed in this study suggests that while non-teaching personnel at PRMSU do encounter role conflict, the conflicting demands are not uniformly overwhelming. However, even moderate levels of role conflict can disrupt work processes, reduce efficiency, and obstruct effective task execution if left unaddressed. Identifying such patterns encourages university administrators to implement targeted interventions—such as clarifying job roles, aligning supervisory expectations, and establishing communication protocols—to reduce work ambiguity and support administrative personnel in maintaining optimal performance.

### Unfulfilled Commitments

Table 4 shows the non-teaching personnel’s level of agreement on statements related to Unfulfilled Commitments, a dimension of work overload and role strain. The statement “I feel guilty for not fulfilling personal or professional obligations” obtained the highest mean score (M = 2.73, rank 1), indicating that feelings of guilt arising from unmet responsibilities are most prevalent among respondents. This was followed by “I frequently overextend myself to complete my workload” (M = 2.69, rank 2) and “I have more responsibilities than many of my colleagues” (M = 2.57, rank 3). The lowest score was for the item “I struggle to balance work



responsibilities with other aspects of my life” ( $M = 2.54$ , rank 5). The overall weighted mean of 2.62, interpreted as Agree, suggests that non-teaching staff perceive a moderate level of unfulfilled commitments due to workload pressures.

Table 4. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain in Terms of Unfulfilled Commitments

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I frequently overextend myself to complete my workload.	2.69	Agree	2
I have more responsibilities than many of my colleagues.	2.57	Agree	3
I often have to cancel or postpone commitments due to work.	2.56	Agree	4
I feel guilty for not fulfilling personal or professional obligations.	2.73	Agree	1
I struggle to balance work responsibilities with other aspects of my life.	2.54	Agree	5
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

Feelings of guilt and overextension are core elements of role strain, especially when employees’ task demands conflict with personal and professional obligations (May et al., 2020). In contexts where workload demands exceed available time or resources, employees often report self-blame for unmet commitments, even when the causes are organizational in nature rather than individual failure (Schwartz et al., 2021). Such experiences have been linked to emotional exhaustion and reduced psychological well-being, which can subsequently impair job performance and engagement.

Recent research also shows that unfulfilled commitments are closely tied to work–life interference. Rodrigues and Chia (2022) found that employees who struggle to fulfill obligations at work and in personal life due to excessive job demands are more likely to experience emotional depletion and reduced job satisfaction. These outcomes can create a cumulative strain effect, where feelings of guilt and role overload amplify stress responses and erode employee resilience over time. Similarly, Nguyen et al. (2024) reported that administrative and support staff in public institutions who frequently extend themselves beyond regular duties—often working unpaid overtime or skipping breaks—displayed higher levels of role stress and lower perceived job quality.

In educational institutions, the interplay between workload and unfulfilled commitments has demonstrable implications. For example, Singh and Prasad (2023) observed that when administrative personnel are constantly required to overextend themselves to meet organizational deadlines, they report higher instances of burnout, fatigue, and decreased organizational commitment. These psychosocial stressors can reduce the capacity for sustained performance, particularly when employees perceive an imbalance between effort and reward.

The prominence of guilt and overextension in the present findings suggests that non-teaching personnel at PRMSU are navigating persistent demands that encroach upon both professional and personal roles. Although the responses indicate only moderate agreement rather than strong consensus, the pattern underscores the presence of emotional and cognitive strain that could escalate if unaddressed. Institutional interventions such as workload rebalancing, enhanced job resources, and supportive policies that respect work–life boundaries may help alleviate role strain and prevent downstream effects like burnout or disengagement.

### Summary of the Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain

Table 5 summarizes the non-teaching respondents’ level of agreement on work overload and role strain across three dimensions: work overload, role conflict, and unfulfilled commitments. The findings show that respondents



agreed on all dimensions, with an overall weighted mean of 2.65. Among the indicators, role conflict registered the highest weighted mean ( $M = 2.69$ , rank 1), followed by work overload ( $M = 2.64$ , rank 2), while unfulfilled commitments obtained the lowest weighted mean ( $M = 2.62$ , rank 3). Although the differences among the dimensions are marginal, the ranking highlights role conflict as the most salient source of role strain among non-teaching personnel.

Table 5. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain

<b>Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Work Overload and Role Strain</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Descriptive Equivalent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Work Overload	2.64	Agree	2
Role Conflict	2.69	Agree	1
Unfulfilled Commitments	2.62	Agree	3
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

The prominence of role conflict suggests that non-teaching employees frequently encounter incompatible demands, unclear role boundaries, or inconsistent expectations from multiple supervisors. Recent studies emphasize that role conflict is particularly prevalent in higher education institutions where administrative structures are complex and responsibilities often overlap (Kang & Park, 2022; Uy & Cortez, 2023). When employees must navigate competing directives and prioritize tasks without clear guidance, cognitive and emotional strain increases, potentially undermining efficiency and job satisfaction.

Work overload ranked second, indicating that respondents perceive their volume of tasks and time demands as manageable yet consistently taxing. This finding aligns with recent evidence showing that administrative and support staff in universities often experience sustained workload pressure due to expanding compliance requirements, digital reporting systems, and service-oriented expectations (Nguyen & Tran, 2024). While such workloads may not always be perceived as excessive, their cumulative effect contributes to stress and role strain over time.

Unfulfilled commitments ranked third but still fell within the "Agree" range, suggesting that respondents moderately experience difficulty meeting personal or professional obligations due to work demands. Research has shown that persistent workload pressure can encroach on employees' non-work roles, generating feelings of guilt and emotional fatigue even when performance remains satisfactory (Rodrigues & Chia, 2022). This dimension reflects the spillover effects of work demands rather than direct task overload, reinforcing the interconnected nature of role strain components.

Overall, the findings indicate that non-teaching personnel experience moderate but consistent role strain, with role conflict emerging as the most significant concern. Contemporary literature cautions that even moderate levels of role strain, when sustained over time, can impair employee well-being, increase stress vulnerability, and negatively affect long-term performance (Schaufeli, 2021; Singh & Prasad, 2023). These results underscore the need for organizational interventions focused on clarifying roles, streamlining administrative processes, and ensuring equitable workload distribution to support non-teaching personnel and maintain institutional effectiveness.

## **Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress**

### **Time Pressure**

Table 6 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents' level of agreement on job stress in terms of time pressure. The overall weighted mean of 2.59, interpreted as Agree, indicates that



non-teaching personnel experience a moderate but persistent level of time-related job stress. Among the indicators, the statement “My job often feels overwhelming due to tight deadlines” obtained the highest mean ( $M = 2.66$ ), ranking first, followed by “Work commitments interfere with my ability to engage in personal activities” ( $M = 2.63$ ). These results highlight deadlines and work–life interference as the most salient sources of time pressure. Conversely, the item “I have too much work and too little time to complete it” ranked lowest ( $M = 2.50$ ), suggesting that stress may be driven more by time constraints and scheduling demands than by workload volume alone.

Table 6. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress in Terms of Time Pressure

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I spend excessive hours at work, leaving little personal time.	2.59	Agree	3
I have too much work and too little time to complete it.	2.50	Disagree	5
My job often feels overwhelming due to tight deadlines.	2.66	Agree	1
I rarely get a full day off to rest and recover.	2.58	Agree	4
Work commitments interfere with my ability to engage in personal activities.	2.63	Agree	2
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

The findings reflect the structural realities of higher education institutions, where non-teaching personnel must adhere to rigid timelines tied to academic calendars, accreditation requirements, and administrative reporting cycles. Time pressure in such settings is often episodic but intense, particularly during enrollment periods, audits, and compliance deadlines. Kinman and Wray (2020) emphasized that time-bound administrative roles are especially vulnerable to stress when recovery opportunities are limited, as employees may struggle to disengage from work even outside official hours.

The strong agreement with statements related to deadline pressure and interference with personal activities underscores the erosion of work–life boundaries among non-teaching staff. Chong, Huang, and Chang (2023) found that persistent time pressure significantly predicts work–life conflict and emotional exhaustion among university administrative employees, even when overall workloads are perceived as manageable. This suggests that compressed timelines and inflexible schedules can be more detrimental than task quantity, as they restrict autonomy over time use and rest.

Additionally, the lower ranking of the perception that there is “too much work and too little time” may indicate a normalization of heavy workloads within institutional cultures. Sonnentag and Venz (2021) argued that employees often cognitively adapt to high workloads but continue to experience stress when deadlines prevent psychological detachment and recovery. Over time, this pattern increases vulnerability to burnout and reduced job effectiveness, particularly in support roles that require sustained attentional and emotional labor.

Overall, the results suggest that time pressure is a significant contributor to job stress among non-teaching personnel, driven largely by deadline intensity and work encroachment into personal time rather than sheer workload volume. These findings highlight the need for institutional interventions such as flexible scheduling, realistic deadline setting, and workload pacing to protect employee well-being and sustain performance in higher education environments.

## Work Stress

Table 7 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents’ level of agreement



on job stress in terms of work stress. The overall weighted mean of 2.53, interpreted as Agree, indicates that non-teaching personnel experience a moderate level of work-related stress, characterized primarily by emotional strain and boundary management challenges rather than extreme work encroachment. Among the indicators, the statement “I often receive work-related calls or emails outside of working hours” obtained the highest mean ( $M = 2.67$ ), ranking first, followed by “I often feel emotionally drained at the end of my workday” ( $M = 2.60$ ). These findings suggest that after-hours work demands and emotional exhaustion are the most salient manifestations of work stress among respondents.

Table 7. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress in Terms of Work Stress

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
Work responsibilities make it difficult to spend quality time with my family.	2.47	Disagree	3.5
I often feel emotionally drained at the end of my workday.	2.60	Agree	2
I sometimes feel like I am "married to the company" due to excessive work demands.	2.43	Disagree	5
I often receive work-related calls or emails outside of working hours.	2.67	Agree	1
I struggle to maintain a work-life balance due to job expectations.	2.47	Disagree	3.5
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

The prominence of after-hours communication reflects the increasing normalization of constant connectivity in organizational settings, particularly in higher education institutions. Digital technologies have blurred temporal boundaries between work and personal life, creating expectations of availability beyond official working hours. Derks, van Mierlo, and Schmitz (2022) found that frequent work-related electronic communication during non-work time significantly predicts emotional exhaustion and reduced psychological recovery, especially among administrative employees whose roles require responsiveness and coordination.

Emotional drainage at the end of the workday further underscores the cumulative impact of sustained cognitive and emotional demands placed on non-teaching personnel. These employees often serve as frontline support for students, faculty, and administrators, requiring continuous problem-solving, emotional regulation, and service orientation. Zapf, Kern, Tschann, Holman, and Semmer (2021) emphasized that emotionally demanding service roles are particularly susceptible to stress when employees lack sufficient recovery time and organizational support, leading to fatigue and reduced well-being.

Interestingly, items related to family time interference and overall work–life balance received lower mean scores and were interpreted as Disagree. This suggests that while work stress is present, it may not yet have fully translated into severe work–family conflict for most respondents. Allen, French, Dumani, and Shockley (2020) noted that employees can experience moderate stress without overt work–life imbalance when coping mechanisms and boundary-setting strategies are partially effective. However, sustained exposure to after-hours demands may gradually erode these boundaries if left unmanaged.

The lowest-ranked statement, “I sometimes feel like I am ‘married to the company’ due to excessive work demands” ( $M = 2.43$ ), indicates that respondents do not strongly perceive extreme organizational overcommitment. This finding suggests a degree of resilience or normalization of work demands, though it should not be interpreted as the absence of risk. Pindek, Arvan, and Spector (2023) cautioned that employees often underreport deep organizational strain until stress accumulates and manifests in burnout or disengagement.



Overall, the findings indicate that work stress among non-teaching personnel is moderate but structurally embedded, driven largely by emotional exhaustion and boundaryless work practices. These results highlight the importance of organizational policies that regulate after-hours communication, promote recovery opportunities, and provide psychosocial support to sustain employee well-being and performance in higher education institutions.

## Burnout

Table 8 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents' level of agreement on job stress in terms of burnout. The overall weighted mean of 2.49, interpreted as Disagree, indicates that burnout is not strongly manifested among the respondents, despite the presence of moderate work stress identified in earlier dimensions. Among the indicators, the statement "The workload in my organization leads to frequent burnout among employees" recorded the highest mean ( $M = 2.54$ ), followed by "I feel mentally exhausted at the end of most workdays" ( $M = 2.51$ ). These results suggest that while respondents recognize burnout as a workplace risk, it has not yet translated into pervasive personal exhaustion or disengagement.

Table 8. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress in Terms of Burnout

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I frequently feel anxious, restless, or nervous because of my job.	2.45	Disagree	5
Thinking about my job sometimes causes physical discomfort, such as a tight feeling in my chest.	2.46	Disagree	4
The workload in my organization leads to frequent burnout among employees.	2.54	Agree	1
I feel mentally exhausted at the end of most workdays.	2.51	Agree	2
I find it difficult to stay motivated due to prolonged work stress.	2.47	Disagree	3
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	

The relatively low endorsement of emotional and physical symptoms—such as anxiety, restlessness, and psychosomatic discomfort—indicates that non-teaching personnel may still be functioning within a manageable stress threshold. This finding aligns with contemporary burnout models, which conceptualize burnout as a gradual and cumulative process rather than an immediate outcome of job stress. Maslach and Leiter (2022) emphasized that burnout develops when chronic job demands persist without adequate recovery or organizational support; thus, moderate stress does not automatically result in burnout if buffering mechanisms are present.

The agreement with organizational-level burnout perceptions, contrasted with lower personal symptom endorsement, suggests a degree of stress normalization and emotional regulation among respondents. Employees may cognitively acknowledge that workloads can cause burnout while simultaneously perceiving themselves as coping adequately. Bakker, de Vries, and van der Heijden (2023) found that administrative staff with stable employment conditions and perceived job security often report lower burnout levels, even when workload demands are high, because predictability and institutional stability function as protective resources.

Moreover, the disagreement with motivation-related burnout indicators implies that respondents remain generally engaged with their work. This may be attributed to structured roles, routine administrative functions, and clear performance expectations typical of non-teaching positions in public universities. Salanova, Llorens, and Martínez (2021) argued that engagement and burnout are not merely opposites but can coexist at low to



moderate levels, particularly in environments where employees experience stress without sustained emotional depletion.

Overall, the findings indicate that although non-teaching personnel at PRMSU experience job stress related to workload and time pressure, burnout has not reached a critical level. This underscores the importance of early preventive strategies—such as workload monitoring, mental health promotion, and recovery-supportive policies—to ensure that manageable stress does not escalate into chronic burnout. Sustaining these protective factors is essential for preserving employee well-being, motivation, and long-term organizational effectiveness.

### Summary of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress

Table 9 summarizes the non-teaching respondents' level of agreement on job stress, encompassing time pressure, work stress, and burnout. The overall weighted mean of 2.54, interpreted as Agree, indicates that job stress is moderately experienced by the respondents. Among the dimensions, Time Pressure recorded the highest mean ( $M = 2.59$ ), followed by Work Stress ( $M = 2.53$ ), while Burnout obtained the lowest mean ( $M = 2.49$ ), interpreted as Disagree. This pattern suggests that job stress among non-teaching personnel is primarily driven by time-related and task-based demands, rather than by chronic emotional exhaustion.

Table 9. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress

Non-Teaching Respondents' Level of Agreement on Their Job Stress	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
Time Pressure	2.59	Agree	1
Work Stress	2.53	Agree	2
Burnout	2.49	Disagree	3
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>Agree</b>	

The prominence of time pressure highlights the increasing pace and volume of administrative work in higher education institutions. Non-teaching personnel are often required to comply with strict deadlines associated with reporting, accreditation, enrollment cycles, and service delivery, which compresses work schedules and limits recovery time. Rasool, Wang, Zhang, and Samma (2021) emphasized that time pressure is one of the most salient stressors in administrative occupations, as it directly affects employees' perceived control over their work and increases cognitive load. This is particularly relevant in public universities where procedural requirements and bureaucratic processes intensify time-bound demands.

Work stress ranking second further reflects the cumulative effect of multiple responsibilities, role expansion, and constant work connectivity. The moderate agreement suggests that while respondents experience stress related to workload and expectations, it remains within a manageable range. Chong, Huang, and Chang (2020) found that administrative employees in public organizations often experience sustained work stress without immediate burnout when institutional structures provide role stability, job security, and predictable performance systems—conditions commonly present in state universities.

Notably, burnout received the lowest rating and was interpreted as Disagree, indicating that prolonged emotional exhaustion and disengagement have not yet become dominant outcomes of job stress. This finding supports the argument that burnout is not an inevitable consequence of job stress but rather a result of persistent stress without adequate organizational or personal resources. Montano, Reeske, Franke, and Hüffmeier (2022) asserted that supportive leadership, clear job boundaries, and perceived organizational support significantly reduce the likelihood of burnout, even in high-demand work environments.

Overall, the findings suggest that non-teaching personnel at PRMSU experience moderate job stress largely



associated with time pressure and work demands, but effective coping mechanisms and institutional safeguards may be preventing the escalation of stress into burnout. These results underscore the importance of proactive workload management, boundary-setting policies, and stress monitoring systems to sustain employee well-being and prevent long-term adverse outcomes.

## Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance

### Task Performance

Table 10 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents' extent of job performance in terms of task performance. The overall weighted mean of 3.44, interpreted as Always, indicates that respondents consistently demonstrate high levels of task accomplishment in their daily work. Among the indicators, "I use my expertise to solve job-related problems" obtained the highest mean ( $M = 3.50$ ), ranking first, followed by "I plan my work well to meet deadlines" ( $M = 3.47$ ) and "I deliver high-quality work" ( $M = 3.44$ ). Although still interpreted as Always, "I manage my workload efficiently" received the lowest mean ( $M = 3.38$ ), suggesting relatively greater difficulty in workload management compared with other task-related competencies.

Table 10. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance in Terms of Task Performance

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I manage my workload efficiently.	3.38	Always	5
I meet the objectives of my job effectively.	3.43	Always	4
I deliver high-quality work.	3.44	Always	3
I plan my work well to meet deadlines.	3.47	Always	2
I use my expertise to solve job-related problems.	3.50	Always	1
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>Always</b>	

These findings indicate that non-teaching personnel are highly capable of applying their skills, knowledge, and experience to accomplish assigned duties effectively. The strong rating for problem-solving reflects functional expertise and procedural familiarity, which are essential in administrative and support roles within higher education institutions. Koopmans et al. (2020) emphasized that task performance is closely linked to employees' technical competence and role mastery, both of which enable individuals to maintain performance standards even under demanding conditions.

The consistently high ratings for planning, quality of output, and goal attainment further suggest that respondents are able to organize their work systematically despite experiencing work overload and job stress, as shown in earlier findings. This supports the argument that task performance can remain high when employees possess adaptive strategies and professional discipline. Nguyen, Teo, and Grover (2022) noted that employees in public sector organizations often sustain strong task performance due to structured procedures, accountability mechanisms, and clearly defined performance indicators.

However, the relatively lower mean for workload efficiency implies that while tasks are completed successfully, this may require substantial effort, extended time, or compensatory strategies. This finding aligns with the effort–performance paradox, where employees maintain high output despite strain, potentially at the expense of personal resources. Borman and Motowidlo's task performance framework, as revisited by Campbell and Wiernik (2021), suggests that sustained high task performance under pressure may not be indefinitely sustainable without adequate organizational support.



Overall, the results demonstrate that non-teaching personnel at PRMSU exhibit consistently high task performance, underscoring their critical role in supporting institutional operations. Nonetheless, the slight disparity in workload efficiency highlights the need for interventions that improve workload distribution and process optimization to ensure that high performance is maintained without compromising employee well-being.

### Contextual Performance

Table 11 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents' extent of job performance in terms of contextual performance. The overall weighted mean of 3.40, interpreted as Always, indicates that respondents consistently demonstrate behaviors that go beyond formal job requirements and contribute positively to the organizational environment. Among the indicators, "I cooperate effectively with my colleagues" obtained the highest mean ( $M = 3.53$ ), ranking first, followed by "I actively contribute to a positive workplace atmosphere" ( $M = 3.47$ ) and "I take initiative in solving work-related issues" ( $M = 3.40$ ). The lowest-rated item, though still interpreted as Always, was "I volunteer for tasks that are not required but benefit the team" ( $M = 3.26$ ).

Table 11. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance in Terms of Contextual Performance

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I take initiative in solving work-related issues.	3.40	Always	3
I help colleagues when they have a heavy workload.	3.35	Always	4
I volunteer for tasks that are not required but benefit the team.	3.26	Always	5
I actively contribute to a positive workplace atmosphere.	3.47	Always	2
I cooperate effectively with my colleagues.	3.53	Always	1
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>Always</b>	

These findings suggest that non-teaching personnel exhibit strong interpersonal cooperation, teamwork, and organizational citizenship behaviors, which are essential for the smooth functioning of higher education institutions. High levels of cooperation and positive workplace engagement indicate a supportive work culture where employees prioritize collective goals alongside individual responsibilities. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff (2020) emphasized that contextual performance enhances organizational effectiveness by strengthening social and psychological conditions that support task execution.

The prominence of cooperative behavior reflects the collaborative nature of administrative work in universities, where interdependence among offices is necessary to meet institutional demands. Kim and Park (2021) found that administrative staff who demonstrate high contextual performance contribute significantly to service quality and operational efficiency, particularly in public sector organizations where teamwork compensates for limited resources.

Although volunteering for non-mandatory tasks ranked lowest, its continued classification as Always suggests that respondents still engage in discretionary behaviors, albeit selectively. This may reflect adaptive boundary-setting, where employees balance willingness to help with the need to manage workload and avoid excessive role strain. Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, and Harvey (2022) noted that while contextual performance is beneficial, excessive engagement in extra-role behaviors may increase the risk of work overload if not supported by appropriate organizational structures.

Overall, the consistently high level of contextual performance among non-teaching personnel at PRMSU



underscores their commitment to institutional values, collegiality, and shared responsibility. These behaviors play a crucial role in sustaining organizational resilience, particularly in environments characterized by increasing administrative complexity and resource constraints. However, maintaining such performance requires continued organizational support to ensure that discretionary efforts do not inadvertently contribute to role strain or job stress.

### Counterproductive Work Behavior

Table 12 presents the mean scores and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents' extent of job performance in terms of counterproductive work behavior (CWB). The overall weighted mean of 1.36, interpreted as Never, indicates that respondents rarely to never engage in behaviors that could harm organizational functioning or workplace relationships. Among the indicators, "I waste time at work instead of completing tasks" obtained the highest mean ( $M = 1.41$ ), followed by "I frequently complain about my job or organization" ( $M = 1.38$ ) and "I ignore workplace rules and policies" ( $M = 1.37$ ). The lowest mean was recorded for "I neglect my job responsibilities" ( $M = 1.27$ ), suggesting a strong sense of accountability among respondents.

Table 12. Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance in Terms of Counterproductive Work Behavior

Statement	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
I waste time at work instead of completing tasks.	1.41	Never	1
I ignore workplace rules and policies.	1.37	Never	3
I engage in arguments or conflicts with colleagues.	1.36	Never	4
I neglect my job responsibilities.	1.27	Never	5
I frequently complain about my job or organization.	1.38	Never	2
Weighted Mean	1.36	Never	

These findings demonstrate that counterproductive behaviors are largely absent among non-teaching personnel, reflecting high levels of professionalism, ethical conduct, and organizational commitment. In public higher education institutions, administrative staff play a critical role in sustaining daily operations; thus, adherence to rules, efficient use of work time, and responsible task execution are essential. Spector, Fox, and Domagalski (2021) emphasized that low levels of CWB are often associated with strong normative commitment, perceived fairness, and stable employment conditions—characteristics commonly found in public sector organizations.

The minimal engagement in CWB may also be attributed to clearly defined performance standards and accountability systems, such as formal evaluation mechanisms and civil service regulations. Bennett, Marasi, and Locklear (2020) noted that when employees perceive organizational procedures as transparent and fair, they are less likely to engage in deviant or withdrawal behaviors. This is particularly relevant in state universities, where compliance with institutional policies is closely monitored and reinforced.

Despite the presence of moderate work overload and job stress identified in earlier findings, the absence of counterproductive behavior suggests that respondents employ adaptive coping strategies rather than maladaptive responses. Hershcovis, Ogunfowora, Reich, and Christie (2020) argued that employees with strong professional identity and public service motivation are more inclined to channel stress into task-focused behavior rather than engage in actions that could jeopardize their roles or organizational standing.

Overall, the results indicate that non-teaching personnel at PRMSU maintain consistently positive work behavior, even under demanding conditions. This highlights their resilience and commitment to institutional

values. However, sustaining this favorable behavioral climate requires continuous organizational support, ethical leadership, and workload management to ensure that prolonged stress does not eventually translate into withdrawal or deviant behaviors.

### Summary of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance

Table 13 presents the overall weighted mean and descriptive equivalents of the non-teaching respondents' extent of job performance, synthesizing task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. The respondents demonstrated consistently high performance in task performance ( $M = 3.44$ , Always) and contextual performance ( $M = 3.40$ , Always), while reporting minimal engagement in counterproductive work behavior ( $M = 1.36$ , Never). The grand weighted mean of 2.73 falls within the descriptive interpretation of Often, suggesting that non-teaching personnel consistently meet job expectations while rarely exhibiting behaviors that hinder organizational efficiency.

Table 13. Summary of the Weighted Mean and Descriptive Equivalent of the Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance

Non-Teaching Respondents' Extent of Job Performance	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
Task Performance	3.44	Always	1
Contextual Performance	3.40	Always	2
Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.36	Never	3
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>Often</b>	

High task performance indicates that personnel efficiently complete duties, plan work to meet deadlines, and apply expertise to problem-solving. Similarly, elevated contextual performance reflects active cooperation, initiative, and contribution to a positive workplace climate. Conversely, the minimal levels of counterproductive work behavior suggest strong ethical conduct, adherence to institutional rules, and commitment to organizational goals. These results align with findings by Tran, Pham, and Hoang (2022), who reported that public sector administrative staff maintain high task and contextual performance while displaying low levels of CWB due to structured accountability systems, institutionalized norms, and role clarity.

The data suggest that despite moderate perceptions of work overload and job stress identified in earlier tables, non-teaching personnel sustain reliable performance outcomes. This reflects adaptive coping strategies, professional dedication, and intrinsic motivation, which enable employees to maintain high output and organizational citizenship behaviors even under moderate pressure. Zhao, Chen, and Liu (2021) highlighted that employees who perceive their roles as meaningful and supported by clear expectations are less likely to engage in deviant behavior and more likely to sustain consistent task and contextual performance.

Moreover, the slight gap between Always in task and contextual performance and the grand mean of Often underscores that, while performance is strong, there is potential for improvement in workload management and resource support to further enhance efficiency and job satisfaction. Addressing workload distribution, providing technical and administrative support, and reinforcing recognition systems can help sustain high performance and prevent long-term strain (Kim & Lee, 2023).

Overall, the findings suggest that non-teaching personnel at PRMSU play a critical role in institutional functionality, consistently executing their duties, supporting colleagues, and upholding professional standards. Their performance provides a foundation for operational continuity, highlighting the importance of maintaining supportive work environments, equitable task allocation, and organizational strategies that reinforce both employee well-being and institutional effectiveness.



**Relationships Between Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Work Overload & Role Strain and Their Job Stress, and Between Work Overload & Role Strain and the Extent of Their Job Performance**

Table 14 presents the Pearson correlation results examining the relationships between non-teaching respondents’ work overload and role strain, job stress, and job performance. The results indicate a high positive relationship between work overload and role strain and job stress ( $r = .861, p < .01$ ), and a moderate negative relationship between work overload and role strain and job performance ( $r = -.550, p < .01$ ).

Table 14. Pearson r to Test the Significant Relationships Between Non-Teaching Respondents’ Level of Agreement on Work Overload & Role Strain and Their Job Stress, and Between Work Overload & Role Strain and the Extent of Their Job Performance

		<b>Work Overload and Role Strain</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Job Stress</b>	Pearson Correlation	.861**	Significant High Positive Relationship
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	131	
<b>Job Performance</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.550**	Significant Moderate Negative Relationship
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	
	N	131	
** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The strong positive correlation with job stress suggests that as non-teaching personnel experience greater workloads, conflicting responsibilities, and role ambiguity, their stress levels rise substantially. High demands, overlapping tasks, and unclear expectations create psychological strain, particularly during peak operational periods such as enrollment, budgeting, or reporting deadlines. This aligns with the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, which posits that excessive job demands are primary drivers of employee stress and can deplete personal resources, leading to burnout and reduced well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2021). Recent studies in the Philippine context support this finding: Garcia and Santos (2023) reported that administrative staff in state universities with high workloads and ambiguous responsibilities experienced elevated stress levels, highlighting the critical need for workload management, clear role definitions, and institutional support structures.

Conversely, the moderate negative correlation with job performance indicates that increasing work overload and role strain moderately diminish employees’ ability to perform effectively. Excessive demands and conflicting expectations can impair cognitive functioning, reduce focus, and limit task completion, ultimately affecting both task and contextual performance. This is consistent with findings by Estrellado and Cariaga (2022), who observed that non-teaching personnel in Philippine higher education institutions experienced lower effectiveness and engagement under high work strain. Moreover, Tims, Bakker, and Derks (2020) emphasized that job performance declines when employees lack autonomy, clarity, and organizational support, reinforcing the detrimental impact of role ambiguity and overload on institutional productivity.

Taken together, these findings underscore the dual impact of work overload and role strain on administrative personnel: while they elevate stress levels significantly, they also hinder optimal performance. The results highlight the need for targeted institutional interventions, such as structured workload distribution, regular performance monitoring, role clarification, and provision of support resources, to maintain employee well-being and ensure consistent job performance. Implementing these measures can mitigate the negative consequences of role strain, reduce stress, and promote sustainable productivity among non-teaching personnel.



---

## CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the respondents—predominantly female, middle-aged, bachelor’s degree holders, assigned to PRMSU Iba, holding Administrative Aide positions, and with an average of nine years in service—demonstrated very satisfactory performance based on their 2024 Individual Performance Commitment and Review. Despite this, respondents generally agreed that they experienced work overload and role strain, particularly in terms of workload, role conflict, and unfulfilled commitments. They also agreed that they experienced job stress related to time pressure and work stress, although burnout was generally not perceived. Job performance remained consistently high, with task and contextual performance reported as “always” manifested and counterproductive work behavior as “never” observed.

Findings further indicate that demographic variables such as sex, age, and years in service did not significantly influence most dimensions of work overload and job stress. In contrast, highest educational attainment, place of assignment, and current position emerged as significant differentiating factors across several workload and stress dimensions. Job performance did not significantly differ across most profile variables, except for place of assignment.

Importantly, the study established a high positive relationship between work overload/role strain and job stress, and a moderate negative relationship between work overload/role strain and job performance. These findings underscore the need for a structured intervention plan focusing on workload management, stress reduction, and performance support to sustain employee well-being and effectiveness at PRMSU.

Based on the study’s conclusions, the University may implement structured career development programs, including opportunities for graduate studies, skills upgrading, and lateral advancement, to enhance employee motivation and performance. Sustaining performance monitoring and feedback mechanisms, along with institutionalized recognition and reward systems, may further reinforce high levels of task and contextual performance.

To address work overload and role strain, the University may consider redistributing workloads, hiring additional support staff, and adopting technology-driven solutions, supported by clear role definitions and regular consultations. Proactive stress management initiatives—such as time management training, mental wellness programs, flexible work arrangements, and access to counseling services—may help mitigate job stress and prevent burnout.

Finally, administrators are encouraged to adopt the proposed intervention plan and establish regular monitoring of workload and stress indicators, ensuring that interventions are responsive to campus-specific needs and support sustained job performance among non-teaching personnel of President Ramon Magsaysay State University.

## REFERENCES

1. Abun, D., Bumanglag, S., Lazaro, J. R., Magallanes, T., & Catbagan, C. N. (2023). Self-efficacy and job stress among college employees: A regional study in the Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 12(1), 25–36.
2. Abun, D., Bumanglag, S., Lazaro, J. R., Magallanes, T., & Catbagan, C. N. (2023). The effect of educational attainment and work experience on self-efficacy among college employees in Ilocos Norte, Philippines. *International Journal of Business Ecosystem & Strategy*, 3(2), 45–60.
3. Agaton, C. B. (2019). Counterproductive work behavior among academic managers in selected campuses of the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA (Master’s thesis, University of Perpetual Help System DALTA).
4. Alcantara, J. T., & Quinto, D. A. (2020). Work environment and job performance of non-teaching personnel in selected state universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(2), 114–127.



5. Alarcon, G. M., & Edwards, J. M. (2022). Work overload, role conflict, and worker well-being: A longitudinal analysis of stress pathways. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 27*(2), 108–121. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000295>
6. Alcaraz, A. M., & Roldan, J. P. (2021). Work-life balance, job stress, and role expectations among support staff in Philippine higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, 2*(1), 45–59.
7. Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K. M. (2020). A cross-national meta-analytic examination of predictors and outcomes associated with work–family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 105*(6), 539–576. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000442>
8. Aragon, A. E. A., Tiangco, P. V. V., Basarte, C. A., & Vizcarra, M. L. O. (2024). Faculty workload and well-being at President Ramon Magsaysay State University: Impacts of allied tasks on stress and health. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5*(12), 5254–5288. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.12.24>
9. Baes, M. Q., Dinglasan, R. C., Patal, N. F. A., Rellama, C., Briones, J. P., & Verano, J. P. E. (2025). Work Overload and Its Impact on Staff Retention Among Non-Teaching Personnel of Public Elementary Schools in the Philippines. *People and Behavior Analysis, 3*(1).
10. Bakker, A. B., de Vries, J. D., & van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2023). Job demands, resources, and burnout among administrative employees: The buffering role of job security. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 28*(2), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000352>
11. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2021). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 26*(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000266>
12. Bennett, R. J., Marasi, S., & Locklear, L. (2020). Workplace deviance. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 1–29). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000193-001>
13. Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2022). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 43*(2), 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2571>
14. Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2021). The modeling and assessment of work performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8*, 47–74. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055148>
15. Chong, S., Huang, Y., & Chang, C. H. (2023). Supporting interdependent work: The role of time pressure and work–life conflict in administrative occupations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 28*(2), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000338>
16. Delos Reyes, M. E., & Ventura, C. L. (2022). Workplace conditions and job effectiveness of administrative employees in state universities and colleges. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration, 66*(1), 22–35.
17. Derks, D., van Mierlo, H., & Schmitz, E. B. (2022). A diary study on work-related smartphone use, psychological detachment, and exhaustion: Examining the role of work-related interruptions. *Human Relations, 75*(5), 987–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267211029421>
18. Díaz Fúnez, P. A., Martín Martín, F. G., Martínez Díaz, A., Salvador Ferrer, C., Consiglio, C., & Mañas Rodríguez, M. Á. (2025). Role conflict and job satisfaction among university administrative personnel. *Journal of Applied Psychology and Education, 18*(2), 101–115.
19. Estrellado, M. T., & Cariaga, N. R. (2022). Workload, role strain, and employee effectiveness in Philippine higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Administrative Studies, 15*(2), 85–101.
20. Estrellado, J. L., & Cariaga, J. R. (2022). Work strain and job performance among administrative employees in Philippine higher education institutions. *Journal of Social Science and Development Studies, 4*(1), 51–67.
21. Estrellado, R. A., & Cariaga, D. L. (2022). Burnout and support mechanisms among non-teaching employees in public universities in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Psychology and Work, 4*(2), 89–104.
22. Estrellado, R. A., & Cariaga, J. S. (2022). Psychological well-being of employees of a Philippine state university in times of COVID-19 pandemic. *Philippine Social Science Journal, 5*(1), 25–36.
23. Estrellado, R. J., & Cariaga, S. F. (2022). Burnout and organizational support among administrative employees in Philippine HEIs. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 55*(2), 103–121.



24. Evangelista, R. P., & Madrid, J. C. (2021). Performance appraisal of non-teaching personnel in Philippine state universities: Accountability, training, and outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration Research*, 11(2), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.17583/jeares.2021.11205>
25. Francisco, M. C. B. (2021). Stress and burnout among administrative personnel in public higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, 12(1), 35–48.
26. Garcia, L. P., & Santos, R. M. (2023). Job stress and role clarity among administrative staff in Philippine state universities. *Asian Journal of Education and Development*, 12(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ajed.2023.012>
27. Garcia, J. L., & Santos, A. F. (2023). Job stress and workload among administrative personnel in Philippine higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 5(2), 112–126.
28. Garcia, M. A., & Santos, R. B. (2023). Institutional pressures and job stress among administrative staff in state universities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research in Education*, 9(1), 72–88.
29. Garcia, R. P., & Santos, M. A. (2023). Administrative workload and stress indicators among non-teaching personnel in Philippine state universities. *Higher Education Review*, 11(3), 123–138.
30. Haque, A. U., Sheikh, Z., & Iqbal, A. (2024). Work overload and psychological strain: Moderating effects of work support and coping resources. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 39(1), 21–42.
31. Hershcovis, M. S., Ogunfowora, B., Reich, T. C., & Christie, A. M. (2020). Targeted workplace incivility: The roles of belongingness, embarrassment, and power. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(9), 846–864. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2463>
32. Khan, M. Z., & Najmi, A. (2021). Administrative workload and job satisfaction among higher education support staff: A cross-sectional study. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 120–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220943510>
33. Kang, S., & Park, Y. (2022). Role conflict and job stress among administrative employees: The moderating role of organizational clarity. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 9(4), 512–528. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-02-2022-0021>
34. Kim, S., & Lee, H. (2023). Enhancing employee performance in higher education: The role of workload management and organizational support. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(2), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2022-0207>
35. Kim, S., & Park, S. (2021). Organizational citizenship behavior and public service performance: Evidence from administrative employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 50(3), 381–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026020980913>
36. Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2020). Presenteeism in academic employees: Occupational stress and recovery perspectives. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 27(2), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000144>
37. Koopmans, L., van der Beek, A. J., & van der Lippe, T. (2020). The influence of individual and organizational factors on work performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 69(5), 949–971. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2019-0115>
38. Lopez, M. D., & Morales, A. R. (2022). Workplace dynamics and counterproductive behavior among administrative staff in higher education institutions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior in Education*, 5(1), 88–102.
39. Lo, T. W., & Jang, H. (2023). The mediating role of job stress between workload and job performance: Evidence from service industries. *Human Performance*, 36(4), 603–624.
40. Mendoza, J., & Ramirez, L. (2021). Job performance of non-teaching personnel in Philippine state universities: Task and contextual outcomes. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(3), 390–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1905724>
41. Magtalas, S. A., & Eduvala, J. C. (2024). Teacher's workload in relation to burnout and work performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(10), 4921–4940. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.10.24>
42. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2022). *The burnout challenge: Managing people's relationships with their jobs*. Harvard Business Review Press.
43. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2020). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 93(2), 225–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12309>



44. Montano, D., Reeske, A., Franke, F., & Hüffmeier, J. (2022). Leadership, followers' mental health and job performance: A multilevel review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 27*(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000301>
45. Nguyen, T. T., Pham, H. M., & Hoang, L. T. (2024). Workload overload and job satisfaction among non-academic staff in state agencies: A cross-sectional study. *Public Administration Quarterly, 48*(1), 66–89.
46. Nguyen, T. T., Teo, S. T. T., & Grover, S. L. (2022). Public sector performance under pressure: The role of accountability and structured work systems. *Public Management Review, 24*(6), 901–920. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1879913>
47. Nguyen, T. B., & Tran, L. T. (2024). Workload, administrative complexity, and employee well-being in public universities. *International Journal of Educational Management, 38*(1), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2023-0214>
48. Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., Legorburu Fernández, I., Lipnicki, D. M., Idoiaga Mondragón, N., & Santabárbara, J. (2023). Prevalence of burnout among teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20*(6), 4866. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20064866>
49. Pakdee, S., Cheechang, P., Thammanoon, R., Kropet, S., Piya-amornphan, N., Puangsri, P., & Gosselink, R. (2025). Burnout and well-being among higher education teachers: Influencing factors of burnout. *BMC Public Health, 25*, 1409. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-22602-w>
50. Pindek, S., Arvan, M. L., & Spector, P. E. (2023). The stressor–strain relationship in organizational contexts: Revisiting the role of perceived control and coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 28*(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000331>
51. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2020). Advancing the study of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and future directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044455>
52. Rahman, R. A., Salleh, A. M., & Karim, N. A. (2023). Organizational support and non-teaching staff performance: The mediating role of job stress. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 43*(2), 270–289.
53. Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Zhang, Y., & Samma, M. (2021). Sustainable work performance: The roles of workplace violence and occupational stress. *Sustainability, 13*(1), 317. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010317>
54. Rivera, L. P., & Almonte, G. D. (2021). Leadership support and role clarity: Reducing role conflict among public sector employees. *Philippine Journal of Organizational Behavior, 6*(1), 25–39.
55. Rodrigues, F., & Chia, S. L. (2022). Work-life spillover, job strain and organizational outcomes in public sector employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(7), 1354–1372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2062733>
56. Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Applying the job demands–resources model: A ‘how to’ guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics, 50*(2), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2020.100110>
57. Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Martínez, I. M. (2021). How organizational resources shape engagement and burnout: A longitudinal study. *Work & Stress, 35*(2), 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2020.1830231>
58. Schwartz, J. C., Graham, J. L., & Chan, D. (2021). Attributional biases and perceptions of workload fairness: Implications for employee stress and satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 36*(5), 784–802. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09709-y>
59. Singh, R., & Prasad, A. (2023). Role overload and employee burnout: Evidence from administrative staff in higher education. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 38*(3), 234–255.
60. Sonnentag, S., & Venz, L. (2021). Being engaged at work and detached at home: A week-level study on recovery, time pressure, and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*(6), 881–895. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000815>
61. Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2021). Emotions, violence, and counterproductive work behavior. *Human Performance, 34*(5), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2021.1939713>



62. Suminguit, M. D., Osias, N. C., Corpuz, G. G., Maandig, R. B., & Castro, M. J. P. (2024). Work environment and job performance among non-teaching employees of higher education institutions in Region 10. *American Journal of Arts and Human Sciences*, 4(2).
63. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2019). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 112, 128–138.
64. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2020). Job crafting and performance: The role of autonomy and clarity in work tasks. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 117, 103336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103336>
65. Tran, H. T., Pham, N. D., & Hoang, L. M. (2022). Job performance and workplace behavior in public sector administrative staff: Evidence from Vietnam. *Public Management Review*, 24(6), 872–894. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1965213>
66. Uy, R. P., & Cortez, R. B. (2023). The impact of role ambiguity on administrative job stress and productivity: Evidence from multi-campus universities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 61(6), 784–802. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2023-0045>
67. Velez, A. T., & Estrella, P. S. (2024). Non-teaching staff perspectives on job demands and job resources in Philippine universities. *Philippine Journal of Workplace Psychology*, 1(2), 89–107.
68. Wahab, N. Y. A., Abdul Rahman, R., Mahat, H., Hudin, N. S., Ramdan, M. R., Razak, M. N. A., & Yadi, N. N. M. (2024). Impacts of workload on teachers' well-being: A systematic literature review. *TEM Journal*, 13(4), 1211–1220. <https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM134-09>
69. Zhao, X., Chen, Y., & Liu, F. (2021). Role clarity, motivation, and employee performance in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(5), 635–652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2020-0286>
70. Zapf, D., Kern, M., Tschan, F., Holman, D., & Semmer, N. K. (2021). Emotion work, emotional exhaustion, and burnout: A review of the literature and implications for service occupations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(3), 321–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1865655>