

The Role of Employee Experience in Promoting Workforce Retention

Lucelle E. Saguban

DPA, Foundation University, Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined the level of satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff regarding their work experience and determined whether significant differences existed between the two groups. The study was anchored on the concept of employee experience as a key determinant of workplace satisfaction and employee retention. A descriptive-comparative research design was employed using a structured survey questionnaire administered to teaching and non-teaching personnel. Data were analyzed using the mean, standard deviation, and Mann–Whitney U test at the 0.05 level of significance.

Findings revealed that teaching staff reported an overall very high level of satisfaction ($\bar{x} = 4.40$), whereas non-teaching staff reported a satisfactory level of satisfaction ($\bar{x} = 4.09$). Both groups demonstrated positive perceptions across all dimensions, including onboarding, work environment, job responsibilities, supervision and leadership, career growth and development, compensation and benefits, work relationships, well-being, and recognition and rewards. However, teaching staff consistently reported higher satisfaction ratings across most indicators.

Results of the inferential analysis showed a significant difference between teaching and non-teaching staff in terms of overall work experience ($p = .019$). Significant differences were also identified in work environment, job responsibilities, career growth and development, work relationships, and recognition and rewards. Meanwhile, no significant differences were found in onboarding, supervision and leadership, compensation and benefits, and well-being.

The study concludes that although both groups generally experience positive working conditions, teaching staff demonstrate higher levels of satisfaction than non-teaching staff. The findings highlight the need for institutional interventions focused on equitable career development opportunities, improved recognition systems, and enhanced working conditions for non-teaching personnel in order to promote a more inclusive and supportive workplace environment.

Keywords: employee experience, job satisfaction, workforce retention, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, workplace satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Employee experience plays a vital role in both the employee life cycle and organizational success. It refers to the holistic experience employees encounter throughout their tenure within an organization, beginning from recruitment and onboarding until separation from employment (Employee Experience, 2025). Many organizations attempt to improve employee experience by offering attractive salaries, benefits, and workplace incentives. However, employee experience extends beyond monetary and non-monetary rewards.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, many employees experienced stress, burnout, and social isolation, resulting in decreased engagement and increased turnover intentions. Prior to the pandemic, only 52% of employers considered employee experience an organizational priority. However, a survey conducted by Willis Towers Watson (2021) revealed that 92% of employers recognized employee experience as a critical organizational priority following the pandemic. These findings highlight the growing recognition of employee experience as a key factor influencing workforce retention, productivity, and organizational commitment.

The quality of employee experience is an essential component in fostering a productive and motivated workforce. It encompasses employees' perceptions, emotions, and interactions throughout their organizational journey. In higher education institutions such as Foundation University, the experiences of both teaching and non-teaching personnel significantly influence institutional effectiveness, employee retention, student outcomes, and organizational sustainability. Consequently, understanding employees' perceptions of their work environment is essential in designing policies and strategies that strengthen engagement, satisfaction, and long-term commitment.

Studies conducted in the Philippine context indicate that institutions with high levels of employee satisfaction often demonstrate stronger organizational commitment and improved service delivery (Estanislao & Velasco, 2020; Manila Bulletin, 2022). However, the work experiences of teaching and non-teaching personnel differ because of variations in job responsibilities, professional expectations, and opportunities for career advancement. These differences necessitate a comprehensive comparative analysis.

Although existing literature emphasizes the importance of employee satisfaction in organizational success, most studies conducted in the Philippine setting focus either on teaching personnel in academic institutions or on employee engagement within corporate environments (Estanislao & Velasco, 2020; Ledesma, 2019). Limited studies comparatively examine the experiences of teaching and non-teaching personnel within the same educational institution. This gap is significant because the differing roles, expectations, and working conditions of academic and administrative personnel may result in varying levels of satisfaction and workplace experiences.

Furthermore, while global studies have highlighted the importance of holistic employee experience—including leadership, recognition, well-being, and career development (Morgan, 2017)—local studies often focus narrowly on compensation, benefits, or job security without exploring broader dimensions of employee satisfaction.

This study aims to determine the level of satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff of Foundation University across several dimensions, including onboarding, work environment, job responsibilities, supervision and leadership, career growth and development, compensation and benefits, work relationships, well-being, and recognition and rewards. Specifically, the study seeks to determine whether significant differences exist between the experiences of teaching and non-teaching personnel.

The findings of this study may provide evidence-based insights for the development of institutional interventions aimed at improving employee experience and strengthening workforce retention. Moreover, this study supports Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth by promoting healthy workplace practices and employee well-being.

Research Questions

This study aimed to determine the perspectives of teaching and non-teaching staff of Foundation University regarding their work experience.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

- **What is the level of satisfaction of teaching staff regarding their work experience in terms of:**
 - a. onboarding;
 - b. work environment;
 - c. job responsibilities;
 - d. supervision and leadership;
 - e. career growth and development;
 - f. compensation and benefits;
 - g. work relationships;
 - h. well-being; and
 - i. recognition and rewards?
- **What is the level of satisfaction of non-teaching staff regarding their work experience in terms of:**
 - a. onboarding;
 - b. work environment;
 - c. job responsibilities;
 - d. supervision and leadership;
 - e. career growth and development;
 - f. compensation and benefits;
 - g. work relationships;
 - h. well-being; and
 - i. recognition and rewards?
- **Is there a significant difference between the level of satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff regarding their work experience?**

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design. The descriptive component was employed to determine the level of satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff regarding their work experience. The comparative component was used to identify significant differences between the work experiences of teaching and non-teaching personnel.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Foundation University located along Dr. Meciano Road, Taclobo, Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental. Foundation University was established on July 4, 1949, by Dr. Vicente Guzman Sinco. It is a non-stock, non-profit, and non-sectarian educational institution offering programs in Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Hospitality Management, Criminology, Architecture, Fine Arts, Computer Studies, Education, Nursing, and Industrial Engineering. At the time of the study, the university employed approximately 264 full-time personnel.

Research Respondents

The respondents of the study consisted of active full-time teaching and non-teaching personnel of Foundation University. A total of 60 respondents were randomly selected, comprising 30 teaching staff

and 30 non-teaching staff.

Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were used in analyzing the data:

1. Mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff regarding their work experience.
2. The Mann–Whitney U test was employed to determine whether significant differences existed between the satisfaction levels of teaching and non-teaching personnel.

Data Gathering Procedure and Analysis

The study was initiated by the Professional Resources Management Office of Foundation University to assess employees’ work experiences within the institution. The survey questionnaire was evaluated by three research experts to ensure content validity. Their recommendations and suggestions were incorporated into the revised instrument.

A pilot test was subsequently conducted to determine the reliability of the questionnaire using Cronbach’s alpha. The reliability results indicated that the instrument was appropriate for data collection.

The questionnaire was administered through Google Forms, and the survey link was distributed to the respondents electronically. The collected data were consolidated, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools.

RESULTS

Table 1
Level of Satisfaction of the Teaching Staff on Their Work Experience

Variables	\bar{x}	VD	LoS
1. On-Boarding	4.38	SA	VS
2. Work Environment	4.39	SA	VS
3. Job Responsibilities	4.61	SA	VS
4. Supervision and Leadership	4.39	SA	VS
5. Career Growth and Development	4.48	SA	VS
6. Compensation and Benefits	4.19	A	S
7. Work Relationships	4.56	SA	VS
8. Well-Being	4.24	SA	VS
9. Recognition and Rewards	4.33	SA	VS
Overall	4.40	SA	VS

Legend:	Scale	Verbal Description (VD)	Level of Satisfaction (LoS)
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Satisfied (VS)	
3.41 – 4.20	Agree (A)	Satisfied (S)	
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Satisfied (MS)	
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree (D)	Dissatisfied (D)	
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Dissatisfied (VD)	

Table 2
Level of Satisfaction of the Teaching Staff on Their Work Experience

Variables	\bar{x}	VD	LoS
1. On-Boarding	4.10	A	S
2. Work Environment	4.10	A	S
3. Job Responsibilities	4.18	A	S
4. Supervision and Leadership	4.30	SA	VS
5. Career Growth and Development	4.04	A	S
6. Compensation and Benefits	3.95	A	S
7. Work Relationships	4.27	SA	VS
8. Well-Being	3.97	A	S
9. Recognition and Rewards	3.91	A	S
Overall	4.09	A	S

Legend:

Scale	Verbal Description (VD)	Level of Satisfaction (LoS)
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very Satisfied (VS)
3.41 – 4.20	Agree (A)	Satisfied (S)
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree (MA)	Moderately Satisfied (MS)
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree (D)	Dissatisfied (D)
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Dissatisfied (VD)

Table 3
Difference between the Level of Satisfaction of the Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff on Their Work Experience

Variables	Median	U	p	Decision	Remark
On-Boarding					
• Teaching	4.40	292.5	0.059	Fail to reject H_{03}	Not significant
• Non-Teaching	4.10				
Work Environment					
• Teaching	4.20	272.0	0.027	Reject H_{03}	Significant
• Non-Teaching	4.60				
Job Responsibilities					
• Teaching	5.00	213.5	0.002	Reject H_{03}	Significant
• Non-Teaching	4.20				
Supervision and Leadership					
• Teaching	4.90	339.5	0.244	Fail to reject H_{03}	Not significant
• Non-Teaching	4.20				
Career Growth and Development					
• Teaching	4.70	236.5	0.006	Reject H_{03}	Significant

• Non-Teaching	4.00				
• Compensation and Benefits					
• Teaching	4.20	323.5	0.164	Fail to reject H ₀₃	Not significant
• Non-Teaching	4.00				
• Work Relationships					
• Teaching	4.56	2.60	0.016	Reject H ₀₃	Significant
• Non-Teaching	4.27				
• Well-Being					
• Teaching	4.24	296.5	0.068	Fail to reject H ₀₃	Not significant
• Non-Teaching	3.97				
• Recognition and Rewards					
• Teaching	4.33	264.0	0.019	Reject H ₀₃	Significant
• Non-Teaching	3.91				
• Overall					
• Teaching	4.40	262.5	0.019	Reject H ₀₃	Significant
• Non-Teaching	4.09				

Mann-Whitney U Test at 0.05 Level of Significance; Teaching = 25; Non-Teaching = 33

DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the level of satisfaction of teaching staff regarding their work experience. The overall mean score of 4.40, interpreted as *Strongly Agree* and *Very Satisfied*, indicates that faculty members have a highly positive perception of their overall work experience. This suggests that the institution provides a generally supportive and fulfilling work environment for its teaching personnel.

Among all indicators, *Job Responsibilities* ($\bar{x} = 4.61$), *Work Relationships* ($\bar{x} = 4.56$), and *Career Growth and Development* ($\bar{x} = 4.48$) obtained the highest mean scores, all interpreted as *Very Satisfied*. These findings suggest that faculty members feel competent and fulfilled in carrying out their assigned roles, while also experiencing positive and supportive interpersonal relationships within the workplace. Moreover, the high rating for career growth and development indicates that opportunities for professional advancement and skill enhancement are perceived to be adequate and beneficial.

These findings are consistent with those of Balusan and Selecios (2025), who reported that teaching staff exhibited a “very high level” of satisfaction with their daily activities, describing their responsibilities as genuinely stimulating and intellectually rewarding. Similarly, Fredeluces and Narido (2024) found that teachers demonstrated high levels of satisfaction with the “work itself,” indicating a strong sense of fulfillment and engagement in their core teaching duties.

Notably, work relationships significantly contribute to the job satisfaction of teaching staff. This is supported by Pham (2025), who found that formal recognition from both colleagues and university administration substantially enhances teachers’ sense of satisfaction. Conversely, the absence of collegial communication and professional exchange often results in feelings of isolation and demotivation among faculty members. Furthermore, Sims (2019) emphasized that the quality of school leadership—

particularly the ability to set clear directions while enabling and supporting staff—is a critical predictor of both job satisfaction and employee retention. Strong social connections among faculty members further reinforce job satisfaction and serve as a protective factor against turnover.

In terms of career growth and development, Srivastava and Gupta (2025) found that teachers who engage in meaningful professional development programs report higher levels of job satisfaction, attributed to an enhanced sense of competence, confidence, and motivation in their roles. Moreover, when schools actively prioritize teacher growth, educators tend to feel more valued, which strengthens their connection to the institutional culture and reinforces their commitment to the broader educational mission.

On the other hand, compensation and benefits obtained a weighted mean of 4.19, indicating that teaching staff are generally “satisfied level” with this aspect of their work experience in the university. However, compared to other dimensions, this relatively lower rating suggests the need for a review and re-evaluation of the existing compensation and benefits structure to ensure that it remains competitive and aligned with industry standards.

The findings of Demir-Yıldız (2023) indicate that salary remains a central determinant of job satisfaction among teachers. The qualitative results reveal that compensation is not merely an economic incentive but a critical factor that shapes teachers’ overall professional contentment. Many educators identified salary as the primary element that could enhance their satisfaction level, emphasizing that a high and fair remuneration structure contributes significantly to financial security and sustained instructional performance.

Table 2 presents the level of satisfaction of non-teaching staff regarding their work experience. The overall mean score of 4.09, interpreted as *Agree* and *Satisfied*, indicates that non-teaching personnel generally have a positive but comparatively moderate level of satisfaction with their work experience. While the results reflect favorable perceptions, the ratings are consistently lower than those of the teaching staff, suggesting areas that may require further institutional attention.

The indicators, Supervision and Leadership ($\bar{x} = 4.30$) received the highest rating, interpreted as *Very Satisfied*. This suggests that non-teaching staff perceive their supervisors as supportive and experience positive interpersonal relationships in the workplace. This suggests that leadership practices within the institution promote trust, motivation, and open communication, which contribute to employee confidence and organizational commitment. Effective supervision may also foster a sense of recognition and professional value among non-teaching personnel, leading to improved morale and productivity. This finding aligns with Ortiz (2025), non-teaching employees in private higher education reported being satisfied with the decision-making competence of their supervisors and the manner in which their bosses managed workers. High levels of job satisfaction were observed in the way co-workers integrated and got along with each other. Furthermore, evidence from England indicates a direct linear relationship between staff views of school leadership and their job satisfaction; staff who perceive leaders as supportive report significantly higher satisfaction (Jerrim, 2025).

Notably, Work Relationships also received ($\bar{x} = 4.27$) a “*Very Satisfied*” rating. This implies that non-teaching staff experience positive and healthy interpersonal relationships within the workplace. This suggests that employees maintain harmonious interactions with their colleagues, fostering an environment characterized by cooperation, respect, and mutual support. Positive work relationships contribute to effective teamwork and communication, enabling employees to perform their duties more efficiently and with greater confidence. This corroborates the findings of Obedencio et al. (2025), which revealed that employees experience a strong sense of connection with their coworkers and highly enjoy working with

their colleagues, thereby fostering a positive and collaborative work environment. Furthermore, harmonious cooperation among staff serves as a significant driver of satisfaction, as it promotes mutual support, teamwork, and a healthy organizational climate within the school environment. Such positive interpersonal dynamics contribute to stronger employee engagement, improved morale, and a greater sense of belonging among non-teaching personnel.

On the other hand, Job Responsibilities ($\bar{x} = 4.18$) obtained a “Satisfied” rating. This indicates that while non-teaching staff generally have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities, certain factors may still limit a higher level of satisfaction. The findings suggest that employees are capable of performing their assigned duties effectively; however, some may experience challenges related to workload pressures, limited role flexibility, and insufficient opportunities for skill enhancement and professional growth. This implies the need for the institution to continuously review job assignments, ensure equitable distribution of tasks, and provide support mechanisms that can further enhance employee efficiency, motivation, and overall work satisfaction.

The result is supported by the study of Žygaitienė and Venckienė (2023), who emphasized that employees derive satisfaction when they perceive their work as meaningful, significant, and important to the organization. Their study further revealed that manageable responsibilities and a supportive work structure contribute positively to employee motivation and engagement. However, the researchers also noted that excessive workloads and an intense pace of work may become significant risk factors that negatively affect employee well-being and overall job satisfaction.

Similarly, the “satisfied” rating on work environment implies that while the workplace is generally conducive to work, certain aspects of the physical or psychosocial environment may still affect employees’ overall experiences. Factors such as workplace facilities, availability of resources, comfort, safety, communication systems, and organizational support may influence their level of satisfaction. The result suggests that improving workplace conditions and fostering a more engaging and supportive environment could further strengthen employee morale, productivity, and overall work experience among non-teaching staff.

This finding is supported by the study of Jyotsna and Gupta (2024), which revealed that non-teaching staff in private educational institutions reported a lower level of satisfaction with their work environment compared to teaching staff. The study further emphasized that disparities in recognition and participation in decision-making contributed to the lower satisfaction levels among non-teaching personnel. This indicates that employees value not only the physical aspects of the workplace but also the degree of inclusion, appreciation, and organizational support they receive.

Moreover, the findings of Baes et al. (2025) support the present study by showing that non-teaching personnel in Philippine public schools generally remain satisfied with their jobs despite experiencing workload pressures and demanding tasks. However, stressors such as time pressure and role ambiguity negatively influence their level of job satisfaction. Despite these challenges, non-teaching staff continue to demonstrate strong organizational commitment and a willingness to remain in their institutions. This suggests that enhancing workplace conditions, clarifying job roles, and reducing work-related stressors may further improve satisfaction and strengthen employee retention and engagement.

Career Growth and Development ($\bar{x} = 4.04$) also received a *Satisfied* rating, indicating that non-teaching staff perceive opportunities for professional advancement, although not as strongly as teaching personnel. This finding is supported by the study of Ortiz (2025), which revealed that non-teaching employees in

private higher academic institutions were “moderately satisfied” with opportunities for professional growth and development.

Compensation and Benefits obtained a mean of ($\bar{x} = 3.95$) with *Satisfied* rating, indicating that employees generally perceive the institution’s salary and benefits system positively, although certain concerns remain regarding the adequacy and competitiveness of compensation packages. The result suggests that while employees appreciate the benefits and compensation currently provided, there is still room for improvement in ensuring that remuneration sufficiently addresses employees’ financial, professional, and personal needs. This supports the findings of Suminguit et al. noted that compensation remains an area requiring improvement to further strengthen employee morale, satisfaction, and retention. These findings suggest that institutions may enhance employee satisfaction by reviewing salary structures, expanding employee benefits, and introducing more responsive compensation programs that address employees’ evolving needs and economic realities.

Well-Being received a mean of ($\bar{x} = 3.97$) with *Satisfied* rating, indicating that employees generally perceive a positive balance between their work responsibilities and personal lives. The result implies that the institution provides an environment that supports employees’ overall welfare, although there remain opportunities to further strengthen programs related to mental health, work-life balance, and emotional support. The findings are supported by Ortiz (2025), which found that employees were satisfied with their “total life space,” particularly in terms of how work positively influenced their family relationships, leisure activities, and daily routines. This suggests that employees perceive their work environment as generally supportive of personal well-being and healthy work-life integration. However, the same study also revealed that employees remained neutral regarding growth and security, indicating that uncertainty in career stability may still affect their overall sense of well-being.

Rewards and Recognition obtained the lowest mean among the indicators ($\bar{x} = 3.91$), although it was still interpreted as *Satisfied*. This result suggests that employees generally appreciate the recognition they receive from the institution, yet they may still perceive limitations in the consistency, visibility, or adequacy of reward systems and acknowledgment practices. The findings are consistent with the study of Afaq et al. (2022), which emphasized that employees are more likely to remain satisfied, motivated, and productive when their efforts and contributions are recognized and appreciated appropriately. Recognition fosters a sense of value and belonging, which strengthens employee engagement and commitment to the organization.

Table 3 presents the results of the Mann–Whitney U Test used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the level of satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff. At the 0.05 level of significance, the findings reveal a mix of significant and non-significant differences across the variables, indicating that employee experience varies depending on staff classification.

The overall result ($U = 262.5$, $p = 0.019$) shows a significant difference between teaching and non-teaching staff, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that teaching staff experience significantly higher levels of satisfaction compared to non-teaching staff.

These findings further imply the need for management and administrators to adopt more responsive and differentiated strategies in addressing employee concerns. Since staff classifications may experience work-related conditions differently, policies and programs should consider the unique needs of various employee groups to ensure equitable support and opportunities for growth. Strengthening organizational support, communication systems, and workplace conditions may help reduce disparities in employee experiences and contribute to improved morale, commitment, and productivity.

The findings are supported by several studies discussed in the reviewed literature. Ker et al. (2022) emphasized that job satisfaction is more strongly influenced by the work environment than by individual employee characteristics, suggesting that institutional conditions play a crucial role in shaping employee experiences. Ortan et al. (2021) also noted that supportive relationships and effective organizational management significantly enhance employee well-being and reduce burnout, reinforcing the importance of creating an inclusive and supportive work environment for all staff members. Furthermore, Zakariya (2020) stressed that a positive organizational climate contributes to employee satisfaction and retention, implying that institutions must foster a fair and conducive workplace atmosphere to ensure consistent positive experiences among employees.

Conclusions

The study concludes that both teaching and non-teaching personnel generally experience positive working conditions within the institution. However, teaching staff demonstrated significantly higher levels of satisfaction across several dimensions of employee experience, particularly in career growth, work relationships, and recognition.

The findings further suggest that employee experience significantly influences employee satisfaction and retention. Positive workplace relationships, supportive leadership, meaningful job responsibilities, and opportunities for professional development contribute substantially to employee engagement and organizational commitment.

Nevertheless, disparities between teaching and non-teaching staff indicate the need for more inclusive and equitable institutional policies. In particular, improvements in compensation systems, recognition programs, career advancement opportunities, and workplace support mechanisms may help enhance employee satisfaction among non-teaching personnel.

Overall, the study emphasizes the importance of fostering a supportive and inclusive organizational culture to strengthen workforce retention and institutional sustainability.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of the study, several recommendations are proposed to enhance employee experience and strengthen retention.

First, the institution should implement a more inclusive career development program, particularly for non-teaching staff. Equal access to training, promotions, and professional advancement opportunities should be strengthened to address disparities in career growth satisfaction.

Second, the university should enhance its employee recognition and reward system. A structured and transparent recognition program that acknowledges both teaching and non-teaching contributions will help improve morale and motivation across all staff categories.

Third, although leadership was rated positively, the institution is encouraged to further strengthen participative and inclusive leadership practices, ensuring that both teaching and non-teaching staff feel equally valued in decision-making processes and organizational initiatives.

Fourth, improvements in the work environment for non-teaching staff should be prioritized. This may include upgrading physical working conditions, improving resource accessibility, and ensuring workload balance to enhance job satisfaction.

Fifth, the institution should conduct a review of compensation and benefits structures to ensure competitiveness and fairness. While not significantly different between groups, it remains the lowest-rated dimension and may affect long-term retention if not addressed.

Lastly, it is recommended that the institution establish a continuous employee feedback and satisfaction monitoring system. Regular assessments will allow management to identify emerging concerns early and implement timely interventions to sustain a positive employee experience.

Compliance with Ethical Standards and Use of Artificial Intelligence

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical research standards governing academic inquiry. All data collected from respondents were treated with strict confidentiality and used solely for academic purposes. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, ensuring respect for autonomy, informed consent, and the right to withdraw at any stage without any adverse consequences. The study also ensured that no identifying information of respondents was disclosed in any part of the research output, thereby upholding privacy and data protection principles.

In the analysis and preparation of this manuscript, the researcher utilized Artificial Intelligence (AI)-assisted tools, including generative AI, as a supportive instrument for language refinement, structuring of discussions, and enhancement of academic writing clarity. However, all research design, data collection, interpretation of results, and final decision-making were independently undertaken by the researcher. AI tools were not used to generate or alter raw data, nor to replace critical analysis and scholarly judgment. The researcher ensured that the use of AI complied with academic integrity standards by critically reviewing all AI-assisted outputs for accuracy, relevance, and alignment with the research findings. Any AI-generated suggestions were carefully validated against empirical results and existing literature before inclusion in the final manuscript. Accordingly, responsibility for the content, analysis, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this study remains fully with the researcher.

Conflict of Interest

This research was conducted to determine the employee experience and its effect on the retention rate of teaching and non-teaching staff of the university. The study was carried out with full academic independence and integrity. The researchers declare that there are no conflicts of interest associated with this study. It was not funded, sponsored, or influenced by any organization or external entity. Furthermore, all findings and conclusions presented are impartial and free from bias or undue influence.

REFERENCES

1. Afaq, A., Khan, Q., Arshad, A., Sibte-Ali, M., & Malik, A. A. (2022). The job satisfaction of academic staff in higher educational institutes. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, *10*(1), 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.33687/jsas.010.01.4112>
2. Baes, M. Q., Dinglasan, R. L. 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), 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.31098/pba.v3i1.3030>
3. Balusan, G. A., & Selecios, A. C. (2025). Working condition and job satisfaction among teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *44*(8), 1147–1160. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.440810f>

4. Estanislao, M., & Velasco, J. (2020). Employee engagement and organizational commitment in Philippine institutions. *Philippine Journal of Management Studies*, 8(1), 23–39.
5. Fredeluces, K. K. M., & Narido, N. C. (2024). Working condition and job satisfaction among teachers in Don Carlos Districts, Bukidnon. *International Journal on Science and Technology*.
6. Gallup. (2022). *State of the global workplace 2022 report*. Gallup Press. <https://www.gallup.com>
7. International Labour Organization. (2021). *Working conditions and employee well-being*. ILO. <https://www.ilo.org>
8. Jerrim, J. (2025). The link between school leadership, staff job satisfaction and retention. Longitudinal evidence from England. *British Educational Research Journal*, 51(4), 1582–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4134>
9. Jyotsna, T., & Gupta, U. (2024). A comparative study on job satisfaction between teaching and non-teaching staff in private educational institutions of Bilaspur Division, Chhattisgarh. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 5(5), 1631–1635. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i5.2024.5912>
10. Ker, H., Lee, Y., & Ho, S. (2022). The impact of work environment and teacher attributes on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2022.11.3>
11. Ledesma, M. (2019). Employee satisfaction and performance in higher education institutions. *Asian Journal of Education and Research*, 7(2), 88–102.
12. Manila Bulletin. (2022). Employee satisfaction improves organizational performance. <https://mb.com.ph>
13. Morgan, J. (2017). *The employee experience advantage: How to win the war for talent by giving employees the workspaces they want, the tools they need, and a culture they can celebrate*. Wiley.
14. Obedencio, K. L. C., & Miasco, Jr., W. P. (2025). School-based non-teaching personnel level of satisfaction and their work performance in DepEd Division of Valencia City. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 47(3), 362–370. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.470304>
15. OECD. (2020). *Public service leadership and capability: Strengthening the workforce*. OECD Publishing.
16. Ortan, F., Simut, C., & Simut, R. (2021). *Self-efficacy, job satisfaction and teacher well-being in the K-12 educational system*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(23), 12763. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182312763>
17. Ortiz, J. S. (2025). Mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention among non-teaching employees in private higher academic institutions. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 35(6), 638–646. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.350602>
18. Pham, L. T. T. (2025). Lecturers' job satisfaction as a driver for sustaining English medium instruction programs in Vietnamese higher education. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 27(1), 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2025-0004>
19. Wang, Z., Xu, H., & Liu, Y. (2020). Transformational leadership and employee performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/fpsyg.xxxx>
20. Willis Towers Watson. (2021). *Employee experience survey report*. Willis Towers Watson. <https://www.willistowerswatson.com>

21. Sims, S. (2019). Modelling the relationships between teacher working conditions, job satisfaction and workplace mobility. *British Educational Research Journal*.
22. Srivastava, V., & Gupta, S. (2025). The relationship between professional development and job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, 5(1).
23. Žygaitienė, B., & Venckienė, R. (2023). Factors influencing job satisfaction of higher education teachers. In *5th International Conference on Applied Research in Education* (pp. 32–47).
24. Zakariya, Y. (2020). Effects of school climate and teacher self-efficacy on job satisfaction of mostly STEM teachers: a structural multigroup invariance approach. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00209-4>.