

Status of work-life balance among non-teaching personnel in a city schools division

Delight Claire S. Dilag*

St. Louis College of Bulanao, Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study explored the status of work-life balance among non-teaching personnel in a City Schools Division in the Philippines, with the aim of identifying their level of work-life balance, determining differences when grouped according to profile variables, exploring challenges encountered, and proposing appropriate interventions. This study utilized a multi-method research design employing a sequential explanatory approach, integrating quantitative and qualitative methods. Data were collected from fifty (50) non-teaching personnel through a survey questionnaire adapted from Hayman (2025) complemented by in-depth interviews. Findings revealed that non-teaching personnel generally experience a satisfactory level of work-life balance, marked by low levels of work interference with personal life and personal life interference with work, along with a high level of work-personal life enhancement. Statistical analysis using One-Way ANOVA showed no significant differences in work-life balance when grouped according to sex, age, and years of service. Despite these positive results, qualitative findings revealed key challenges such as transportation issues, workloads, and family-related responsibilities. Based on the results, the study proposed intervention strategies including flexible work arrangements, improved workload management, strengthened communication systems, wellness programs, and capacity-building and workshop initiatives. The findings emphasized the importance of sustained institutional support and policy enhancement to align with the work demand and to further strengthen the work-life balance and overall well-being of non-teaching personnel in the education sector.

Keywords: Work-life balance, non-teaching personnel, education sector, work interference, personal life enhancement, organizational support, flexible work arrangement, employee well-being.

Date Submitted: April 6, 2026

Date Accepted: April 8, 2026

Date Published: April 16, 2026

INTRODUCTION

The work-family balance, which some have defined simply as the ability to achieve both personal and professional fulfillment (Bulger, 2024). It emerged in importance as people seek to reconcile work demands with personal goals, such as family life, leisure activities, self-improvement and total well-being (Kossek & Ollier Malaterre, 2020). The fundamental importance of staff well-being, efficiency and productivity has become increasingly accepted

*Corresponding author/ Email: dilagdelightclaire@gmail.com

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502973>

Recommended citation:

Dilag, D. C. S. (2026). Status of work-life balance among non-teaching personnel in a city schools division. Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (2), 1213-1222. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502973>

in educational establishments around the world, raising concerns about work-life balance for non-teaching staff. This consciousness has resulted in the introduction of a range of supportive initiatives such as remote working, flexible working and mental health schemes.

The education sector, despite its commitment to learning and development, presents a demanding environment for its workforce. Educational institutions frequently contend with budgetary constraints, escalating administrative demands, and the necessity for staff to manage diverse responsibilities. Within this intricate setting, non-teaching personnel, play a crucial role in ensuring the smooth operation of schools, colleges, and universities. Their roles have evolved beyond traditional clerical tasks to encompass complex functions such as project management, data analysis, event coordination, human resources support, and marketing (ABM College, 2024). This expanded role necessitates a broad skill set and deep organizational understanding. However, this complexity, coupled with the dynamic nature of the education field, often compromises the work-life balance of these essential non-teaching staff. The pressure to meet deadlines, manage multiple priorities, and deliver high-quality service can lead to extended working hours, elevated stress levels, and conflicts between professional and personal life.

In many developing nations, the absence of robust institutional support and resources for work-life balance programs is a common issue. Despite governmental efforts to improve working conditions through labor laws, the consistent enforcement and adherence to these legislations remain varied. Nevertheless, a growing global recognition of work-life balance's importance has spurred institutions to adopt technology-based management systems and skill development programs aimed at alleviating pressure and enhancing workplace well-being. These global trends underscore the ongoing need for policy revisions and cultural shifts within workplaces to foster a healthy work-life balance for non-teaching personnel. Employers typically provide work-life balance policies to address employee needs and foster loyalty.

Recent data highlights the profound impact of workplace stress. The American Psychological Association (2023) Work in America Survey revealed that psychological well-being is a top priority for workers, yet 77% reported experiencing work-related stress. Furthermore, 57% indicated negative effects from this stress, including burnout. The survey also pointed to a deficit in employer support for employee well-being; only 35% reported a company culture welcoming break, 40% noted respect for time off, and merely 29% stated that managers actively promoted mental health. In 2023, only 27% of civilian workers, encompassing both private industry and state/local government employees, had access to paid family leave (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023). It is important to note that while work-life balance policies aim to boost employee welfare and loyalty, their actual implementation by employees and their ultimate effectiveness are not always guaranteed. For instance, Goldenstein (2025) reported in the Houston Chronicle that there was a low uptake of a voluntary paid family leave insurance law proposed in Texas in 2023, illustrating challenges in policy adoption and efficacy. Despite calls from bodies like the American Academy of Pediatrics (2024) in its Policy Statement: Paid Family and Medical Leave for universal paid family and medical leave as a health and economic imperative, a significant number of U.S. workers still lack access to such benefits, underscoring the difficulties in establishing effective work-life balance policies.

The pursuit of work-life balance is also a significant concern in the Philippines, which ranked 59th out of 60 nations in the Global Life-Work Balance Index 2024, based on data from Human Resource Platform Remote, as reported by GMA News Online (2024). With an index rating of 27.46 out of 100 and an average work week of 40.63 hours, the Philippines faces considerable challenges in this area. This situation necessitates that both public and private organizations in the Philippines develop comprehensive work-life balance policies that address the physical and mental health needs of their employees. Many non-teaching personnel

encounter issues such as prolonged working hours, high job-related stress, and limited flexible work arrangements, which negatively affect their work-life balance (Baes et al., 2025; Estanio et al., 2023). While labor regulations and Department of Education initiatives such as additional staffing, mental health programs, and technology integration have been implemented to support employee well-being, work-life balance among employees remains a concern, particularly in schools with large student populations and limited staffing. EDCOM II reports reveals systematic staffing shortages and workload imbalance in the Philippines education system, including ratios as high as one staff member per 223 programs and average workweeks reaching 52 hours, conditions that contribute to prolonged working hours and occupational stress among school personnel (Second Congressional Commission on Education, 2024).

The increasing focus on employee welfare within the Philippine education sector underscores the need for enhanced resource management, institutional backing, and rigorous policy enforcement to help non-teaching personnel achieve equilibrium between their personal and professional lives. Recognizing a gap in local research, specifically regarding how organizational policies influence the work-life balance of non-teaching personnel within the Kalinga province, this study aims to investigate the adequacy of current organizational policies in supporting their work-life balance. These policies shape expectations, workload distribution, and flexibility, directly influencing employees' capacity for work-life balance. Policies pertaining to workload allocation, leave provisions, working hours, and support systems are especially crucial in either facilitating or hindering work-life balance. By understanding the role of these policies, this research seeks to identify existing gaps and propose effective interventions to improve the well-being and productivity of non-teaching personnel.

Statement of the problem

This study aimed to explore the work-life balance of non-teaching personnel in the education sector.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following:

1. What is the profile of the participants in terms of gender, age, marital status, and year in service?
2. What is the status of work-life balance among non-teaching personnel in the education sector?
3. Is there a significant difference in the status of work-life balance of non-teaching personnel when grouped according to profile variables?
4. What are the issues and challenges non-teaching personnel in the education sector in relation to work-life balance?
5. What interventions and support mechanisms can be implemented by educational institutions to improve the work-life balance of their non-teaching personnel?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed multi-method using Sequential Explanatory approach, integrating both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative component was used to describe the profile of the participants in terms of gender, age, marital status, years in service, and determine the status of work-life balance among non-teaching personnel, while qualitative component was used to further elaborate the results by exploring the issues and challenges, and interventions and support mechanisms related to work-life balance. The participants of this study comprised of fifty (50) non-teaching personnel from the Department of Education (DepEd) Tabuk City Districts, who were selected through purposive sampling based on the

criteria that they must be currently employed as non-teaching personnel and have at least one (1) year in service, while personnel assigned at the Division Office were excluded to ensure uniformity in work conditions. This study adapted a validated survey questionnaire from the study Work-Life Balance Scale of Hayman (2005), which included three (3) parts: respondent's profile, items measuring the status of work-life balance using five-point Likert scale, and interview guide questions to gather qualitative data on issues, challenges, and interventions and support mechanisms. Prior to data collection, permission was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent, and the researcher administered the survey through both printed questionnaires and online platform via google form, followed by in-depth interviews. Ethical standards were strictly observed, ensuring voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and the right of respondents to withdraw any time without penalty. Data Analysis included the use of descriptive statistics using frequency count and percentage to summarize the participant's profile, and the General Weighted Mean (GWM) to assess the status of work-life balance, while One-Way ANOVA was employed to determine significant differences when grouped according to profile variables. For the qualitative data, Reflexive Thematic Analysis was carried out following the phases of familiarization, coding, theme development, review, definition, and reporting, and data triangulation was applied to integrate both quantitative and qualitative findings for a more thorough interpretation of the results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This presents the analysis and interpretation of data gathered from non-teaching personnel in a City Schools Division in the Philippines to address the objectives of the study. Utilizing a multi-method research design with a sequential explanatory approach, the study integrated quantitative and qualitative data to examine the status of work-life balance, determine differences when grouped according to profile variables, identify challenges encountered, and proposed appropriate interventions.

The quantitative phase used standardized survey instruments measuring Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL), Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW), and Work–Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE), while inferential analysis using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to test significant differences at a 0.05 level of significance. This was supplemented by qualitative responses that provided contextual understanding of the challenges experienced by the participants. The ensuing discussion is grounded strictly on the data gathered, and all findings are interpreted in direct relation to the research objectives of the study.

Profile of the respondents

The respondents were predominantly female (78%), mostly aged 31–45 years (66%), married (70%), and in mid-career stages. In terms of length of service, half had 1–3 years of experience (50%), followed by those with 7 years and above (32%). This distribution reflects a stable workforce composed mainly of female, married, and mid-aged personnel with varying levels of experience, which may influence how work and personal responsibilities are managed within the organization.

Status of work-life balance

The findings indicate a generally favorable work-life balance among non-teaching personnel. Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) ($M = 1.77$) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) ($M = 1.71$) reflect low levels of role conflict, suggesting

minimal disruption between work and personal domains. In contrast, Work–Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) ($M = 4.23$) indicates strong positive spillover, where work and personal life mutually reinforce well-being and productivity. Overall, the results ($M = 2.41$) suggest that respondents experience minimal interference and benefit more from positive interactions between work and personal life.

Work-life balance by profile variables

One-way ANOVA results showed no significant differences in work-life balance when grouped according to sex ($p = 0.704$), age ($p = 0.856$), and years of service ($p = 0.247$). This implies that work-life balance is consistently experienced across demographic groups. The absence of significant differences suggests that institutional practices and working conditions may play a more dominant role in shaping work-life balance than individual characteristics.

Issues and challenges

Despite the generally positive quantitative findings, qualitative data revealed several challenges affecting work-life balance. These include transportation difficulties, heavy workloads with tight deadlines, and family-related responsibilities. Respondents noted that long commutes reduce rest and family time, while workload demands often result in overtime and increased stress. These contextual factors indicate that although overall balance is favorable, specific conditions still create strain for employees.

Interventions and support mechanisms

To address these challenges, respondents suggested several interventions, including flexible work arrangements, workload redistribution, improved time management, wellness programs, mental health support, training and seminars, and enhanced communication systems. Flexible scheduling and workload management were most emphasized, alongside institutional support for employee well-being. These recommendations highlight the need for both personal coping strategies and organizational policies to sustain and further improve work-life balance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the overall findings of the study, it can be concluded that non-teaching personnel in the education sector experienced a generally favorable level of work-life balance. The results indicated low levels of work interference with personal life and personal life interference with work, suggesting that respondents were able to effectively manage the demands of both domains. At the same time, the high level of work–personal life enhancement demonstrated that work and personal life positively influenced one another, contributing to improved well-being, energy, and overall satisfaction.

Furthermore, the findings revealed that there were no significant differences in the status of work-life balance when respondents were grouped according to sex, age, and years of service. This indicated that the experience of work-life balance was relatively consistent across different demographic groups, suggesting that workplace practices and conditions were generally applied in an equitable manner.

However, despite the overall positive results, the qualitative data showed that some challenges persisted, particularly in terms of long commute time, heavy workloads, and family-related responsibilities. These factors highlighted that while work-life balance was generally

maintained, certain situational and organizational conditions could still affect employees' experiences.

In conclusion, the study established that non-teaching personnel were able to maintain a balanced and positive interaction between work and personal life. Nevertheless, continuous efforts to enhance institutional support systems, improve working conditions, and address emerging challenges remain essential to sustain and further strengthen work-life balance among personnel.

REFERENCES

- Abdulaziz, A., Bashir, M., & Alfalih, A. A. (2022). The impact of work-life balance and work overload on teachers' organizational commitment: Do job engagement and perceived organizational support matter. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(7), 9641–9663.
- Ahad, T. R., Khan, N., Subbarao, A., & Rahman, H. M. (2024). Unlocking work-life balance: The impact of participative leadership on reducing emotional exhaustion. *Cogent Business and Management*, 11(1), 2372456.
- Ahmed, S., Ashrafi, D. M., Ahmed, R., Ahmed, E., & Azim, M. (2024). How employee engagement mediates training and development and work-life balance toward job performance in private banks. *The TQM Journal*.
- Allen, T. D., & French, K. A. (2023). Work-family research: A review and next steps. *Personnel Psychology*, 76(2), 437–471.
- American Psychological Association. (2022). Workers appreciate and seek mental health support in the workplace. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-well-being/2022-mental-health-support>
- American Psychological Association. (2023). Workplaces as engines of psychological health and well-being. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-in-america/2023-workplace-health-well-being>
- Anand, S., & Mitra, A. (2022). No family left behind: Flexibility ideals for employees with stigmatized family identities. *Human Relations*, 75(5), 956–988.
- AskSonnie. (2021). Work arrangements and labor policies in the Philippines.
- Brough, P., Timms, C., Chan, X. W., Hawkes, A., & Rasmussen, L. (2022). Work-life balance: Definitions, causes, and consequences. In *Handbook of socioeconomic determinants of occupational health* (pp. 473–487).
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2023). Occupational outlook handbook: Secretaries and administrative assistants. <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/office-and-administrative-support/secretaries-and-administrative-assistants.htm>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

Bulger, C. (2024). Work-life balance. In Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research. Springer.

Casper, W. J., Fox, K. E., Sitzmann, T. M., & Landy, A. L. (2004). Supervisor referrals to work-family programs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(2), 136–151.

Casper, W. J., Hyde, S. A., Smith, S. G., Amirkamali, F., & Wayne, J. H. (2024). How effective are work-life balance policies: The importance of inclusion. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 12.

Chaudhuri, S., Arora, R., & Roy, P. (2020). Work-life balance policies and organizational outcomes. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 52(3), 155–170.

Chung, H., & Van der Lippe, T. (2020). Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 365–381.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work-family border theory. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.

Demerouti, E. (2023). Effective employee strategies for remote working. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 142, 103857.

Department of Education. (2025a). DepEd memorandum no. 077, s. 2025. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>

Department of Education. (2025b). DepEd order no. 16, s. 2025. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>

Department of Education–Bataan. (2025). Employee programs and initiatives report.

DepEd Dasmariñas. (n.d.). Employee wellness and support programs. <https://depeddasma.edu.ph/>

DepEd Laguna. (n.d.). Mental health and wellness programs for personnel. <https://depedlaguna.com/>

DepEd Region IX. (n.d.). Regional employee wellness program initiatives. <https://depedro9.info/>

DepEd Sarangani. (n.d.). Employee wellness program initiatives. <https://depedsarangani.com/>

DepEd San Pablo. (n.d.). Employee wellness initiatives. <https://depedsanpablo.com/>

Doe, J., & Smith, A. (2022). Work-life balance in educational settings. *Journal of Workplace Studies*.

Dugan, A. G., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2020). Working mothers' second shift, personal resources, and self-care. *Community, Work and Family*, 23(1), 62–79.

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2024). Transforming Philippine education: Initial findings and reform recommendations. <https://edcom2.gov.ph/>

- Eren, S., Schweyer, A., Lin, M., & Allen, L. (2023). Job satisfaction 2023 report. The Conference Board.
- Eshun, E. N., & Segbenya, M. (2024). Work-life balance and employee performance in higher education.
- Executive Order No. 78, s. 2025. (2025). Declaring mid-school year wellness break. Government of the Philippines.
- Farid, A., & Jamil, U. (2024). Work-life balance and job performance. *Journal of Personnel Management*, 2(1), 19–25.
- Flynn, E., & Leslie, L. M. (2023). Progressive or pressuring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(1), 1–26.
- French, K. A., & Shockley, K. M. (2020). Formal and informal supports for managing work and family. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(2), 207–216.
- GMA News Online. (2024). Philippines ranks second to last in work-life balance globally. <https://www.gmanetwork.com/>
- Gong, S., & Wang, S. (2022). Family policy awareness and marital intentions. *Demography*, 59(1), 247–266.
- Grabarek, P., & Sawyer, K. (2025). *Leading for wellness*. Wiley.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of work-family conflict. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88.
- Hirmohammadi, M., Au, W. C., & Beigi, M. (2022). Remote work and work-life balance. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 163–181.
- ILoveDepEd. (n.d.). DepEd employee wellness updates. <https://ilovedeped.net/>
- Istikarani, M., Rosnani, T., Marumpe, D. P., Daud, I., & Karsim, K. (2024). Career development and work-life balance. *International Journal of Economics, Business, and Accounting Research*, 8(4).
- Johnson, K. (2020). Impact of job satisfaction on work-life balance. *HR Development Quarterly*.
- Joseph, J. A. (2022). *Institutional work-life balance practices*. University of Nairobi.
- Kim, S., & Park, T. (2021). Emotional support and work-life balance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Kossek, E. E., & Kelliher, C. (2022). Making flexibility more ideal. *Group and Organization Management*, 48(1), 317–349.

- Kossek, E. E., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2020). Sustainable careers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 117, 103315.
- Lambert, S. J., & Haley, A. (2021). Work scheduling regulation. *ILR Review*, 74(5), 1231–1257.
- Lee, R., & Cruz, M. (2021). Flexible work policies in education. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*.
- Mahto, M. K., Kumar, C., & Lad, J. (2024). Work-life balance and job satisfaction.
- McDonald, B. D., & Hatcher, W. (Eds.). (n.d.). *Work-life balance in higher education*. Routledge.
- Morandin, S. P., Rostami, A., & Russo, M. (2024). Digital regulation and work-life balance.
- Nguyen, V. L., & Haar, J. (2024). Work-life balance and organizational citizenship behavior.
- Nwagbara, U. (2020). Work-life balance challenges in Nigeria. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 12(1), 42–54.
- Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2023). Social contagion in work-life practices. *Community, Work and Family*.
- Osso, K., & Halinski, M. (2024). Dark side of work-life policies. *Career Development International*.
- Piszczyk, M. M., & Pimputkar, A. S. (2021). Flexible schedules and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(12), 1907–1920.
- Rahman, N. H. A. (2024). Institutional policies and work-life balance.
- Ramachandaran, S. D. (2025). Work-life balance challenges among academicians.
- Respicio and Co. (2020). Legal insights on telecommuting act. <https://www.respicio.ph/>
- Rothbard, N. P., Beetz, A. M., & Harari, D. (2021). Work-life balance configuration. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology*, 8, 73–103.
- Samsudin, A., Ikaningtiyas, M., Mulia, F., & Rintalla, M. (2024). Career advancement and work-life balance. *Atestasi*, 7(2), 1091–1110.
- Shirmohammadi, M., Au, W. C., & Beigi, M. (2022). Remote work lessons. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 163–181.
- Smart Parenting. (2025). School wellness break benefits. <https://www.smartparenting.com.ph/>
- SunStar Philippines. (2025). DepEd medical allowance. <https://www.sunstar.com.ph/>

- Taylor, P. (2023). Challenges in balancing work and life. *Educational Review Quarterly*.
- Thrasher, G. R., Wynne, K., Baltes, B., & Bramble, R. (2022). Age and gender in work-life balance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 37(7), 683–696.
- Tribune News. (2025). School wellness break announcement. <https://tribune.net.ph/>
- Vaziri, H., Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., et al. (2022). Meta-analysis of work-family balance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(4), 662–692.