

# Assessing Work-Life Balance Among Teaching and Non-Teaching Personnel: A Quantitative Descriptive Analysis

**Bernard Allan V. Mangaron<sup>1</sup>, Jane Rea G. Mangaron<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Nurse II, Health and Nutrition Section, Department of Education - Schools Division Office of Cotabato

<sup>2</sup>Administrative Officer II, Bulakanon Central Elementary School, Department of Education - Schools Division Office of Cotabato

## Abstract

Balancing work and personal life are increasingly important in today's fast-paced world, enhancing health, happiness, and job satisfaction. This study evaluates work-life balance among teaching and non-teaching staff at Makilala Secondary Schools using a non-experimental, cross-sectional design with surveys for data collection. The findings reveal a solid work-life balance, high happiness levels, work satisfaction, and a positive work environment. However, challenges like moderate stress, difficulty de-stressing, and a tendency to bring work home suggest areas for improvement to enhance staff well-being further.

**Keywords:** Work-life balance; happiness; work satisfaction; stress; teaching and non-teaching personnel.

## INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing environment, balancing work and personal life is more crucial than ever. Work-life balance involves efficiently managing time and energy to fulfill job responsibilities while attending to personal relationships, interests, and needs. This balance is essential for promoting health, happiness, and work efficiency (Kalliath, 2008; Brough et al., 2020) [2, 5]. The importance of work-life balance extends beyond individual well-being and enhances job satisfaction and engagement, contributing to overall organizational performance (Cegarra-Leiva et al., 2012; Wayne et al., 2004) [3, 6]. Despite global efforts to promote work-life balance, disparities persist, particularly in regions like Asia, where cultural norms often favor long work hours.

Maintaining a balanced routine in teaching and non-teaching personnel is critical for effective job performance and overall well-being. Educators, for instance, need this balance to effectively engage with students and innovate teaching methods, which directly impact student performance. Non-teaching staff also benefit from work-life balance through improved administrative efficiency and better interpersonal relationships. However, challenges such as long working hours, heavy workloads, and cultural expectations of job dedication can lead to stress and burnout, making it essential to study and address these issues within specific contexts, such as the Schools Division Office of Cotabato, to develop tailored solutions that enhance the well-being of education sector employees.

## METHODOLOGY

The study used a non-experimental, cross-sectional design with surveys to collect data from 257 randomly selected teaching and non-teaching staff at Makilala Secondary Schools. Data were gathered using a digital questionnaire distributed via Google Forms, covering demographic details and aspects of work-life balance such as happiness, job satisfaction, work environment, personal life satisfaction, balance, stress, work brought at home, and time to de-stress, rated on a 5-point scale. The surveys were conducted from July 27 to August 7, 2022. A descriptive-analytical approach was employed to analyze the data, focusing on frequency distributions and mean scores to assess overall satisfaction and identify areas for improvement (Gall et al., 1996; Dulock, 1993) [1, 4]. The study achieved a 4.23% margin of error, ensuring the reliability and validity of the findings.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 outlines the demographic profile of the study participants, including their position, stage of adulthood, gender, marital status, and length of service.

The majority of participants are in the “Teaching Personnel” category (89.1%), followed by “Teaching-related Personnel” (3.9%) and “Non-Teaching Personnel” (7.0%). Most participants are in “Early Adulthood” (55.6%), with fewer in “Early Middle Adulthood” (26.1%) and “Late Middle Adulthood” (18.3%). There is a notable gender imbalance, with most female participants (78.6%) compared to male participants (21.4%). Most participants are married (76.3%), followed by single (21.0%) and widowed (2.7%). In terms of length of service, the largest group has been in their current position for “4-6 years” (53.7%), while “1-3 years” and “7-9 years” categories make up 19.8% and 12.1%, respectively. Those with “10 or more years” of service account for 7.8%, and “less than 12 months” constitute 6.6% of the participants.

**Table 1: Profile of the Participants**

Profile	f	%
Position		
Teaching Personnel	229	89.1
Teaching-related Personnel	10	3.80
Non-teaching Personnel	18	7.00
Total	257	100
Stages of adulthood		
Early Adulthood (Ages 22-34)	143	55.6
Early Middle Adulthood (Ages 35-44)	67	26.1
Late Middle Adulthood (Ages 45-64)	47	18.3
Total	257	100
Sex		
Male	55	21.4
Female	202	78.6
Total	257	100
Civil Status		
Single	54	21.0

Married	196	76.3
Widowed	7	2.7
Total	257	100
Length of Service		
Less than 12 Months	17	6.6
1-3 years	31	12.2
4-6 years	138	53.7
7-9 years	51	19.8
Ten and above years	20	7.8
Total	257	100

Table 2 illustrates the work-life balance of teaching and non-teaching personnel, focusing on key aspects such as happiness, work satisfaction, work environment, personal life satisfaction, balance, stress, work brought home, and time to de-stress. Both teaching and non-teaching staff report high levels of happiness, with significant satisfaction derived from family (mean = 4.510) and salary (mean = 3.790), aligning with the positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance (Elnanto & Suharti, 2021). Employees show high job satisfaction (mean = 3.984) and benefit from supportive work environments (mean = 4.125 and 4.140), contributing to their overall contentment and effectiveness.

However, challenges remain, such as moderate stress (mean = 3.630) and difficulties in maintaining work-life boundaries, with employees frequently bringing work home (mean = 3.942) and struggling to de-stress (mean = 3.471). Although employees value family time and personal life satisfaction (mean = 4.109 and 4.381, respectively), the need for better balance is evident, as they sometimes prioritize family over work (mean = 3.778). The findings suggest improved workload management and strategies to better separate work and personal life, enhancing overall well-being and reducing stress.

**Table 2: Work-life balance of teaching and non-teaching personnel**

Work-Life Balance	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$	Description
Happiness	4.046	0.909	High
Work Satisfaction	4.013	0.828	High
Work Environment	4.133	0.826	High
Personal Life Satisfaction	4.263	0.884	High
Balance	3.571	0.920	High
Stress	3.507	0.892	High
Work Brought at Home	3.579	0.911	High
Time to De-stress	3.358	0.858	Moderate

## CONCLUSION

This study has underscored the overall positive state of work-life balance among teaching and non-teaching personnel in Makilala Secondary Schools, revealing high levels of happiness, job satisfaction, and a supportive work environment. Participants generally expressed fulfillment in their personal and professional lives, reflecting the effectiveness of current workplace practices in fostering well-being. Nevertheless, the findings also highlight critical areas that require attention, particularly in managing

moderate stress levels, the prevalence of work-related tasks being brought home, and challenges in finding adequate time for de-stressing. These factors point to the need for institutional strategies that promote healthier boundaries between professional obligations and personal life.

The results affirm the importance of work-life balance as a determinant of employee satisfaction, motivation, and overall workplace harmony. Therefore, sustained efforts must be made to enhance flexible work arrangements, recognize employee achievements, optimize workload distribution, and promote professional development. Addressing these dimensions will not only improve the quality of life of education personnel but also contribute to a more resilient, efficient, and dynamic school system.

## REFERENCES

1. Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6th ed.). Longman Publishing.
2. Brough, P., Timms, C., Chan, X. W., Hawkes, A., & Rasmussen, L. (2020). Work-Life Balance: Definitions, causes, and consequences. In Handbook series in occupational health sciences (pp. 473–487). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31438-5\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31438-5_20)
3. Cegarra-Leiva, D., Sánchez-Vidal, M. E., & Cegarra-Navarro, J. G. (2012). Understanding the link between work-life balance practices and organizational outcomes in SMEs. *Personnel Review*, 41(3), 359–379. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211212986>
4. Dulock, H. L. (1993). Research design: Descriptive research. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing*, 10(4), 154–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104345429301000406>
5. Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008). Work-life balance: A review of the meaning of the balance construct. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 14(3), 323–327. <https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.837.14.3.323>
6. Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 108–130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791\(03\)00035-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791(03)00035-6)