

# EXPLORING THE GENDER PERSPECTIVE WORK-LIFE BALANCE OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES' MIDDLE-LEVEL MANAGERS AND TEACHERS

**Catheryn C. Panlaqui**

*Bataan Peninsula State University, Philippines*

[ccpanlaqui@bpsu.edu.ph](mailto:ccpanlaqui@bpsu.edu.ph)

## ABSTRACT

*This study investigates the gender perspective work-life balance (WLB) among middle-level managers and teachers in state universities and colleges (SUCs), with a specific focus on developing a gender-based WLB framework. Seven objectives guided the research, including profiling respondents based on age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and designation; assessing WLB and its four elements; understanding respondents' definitions of work-life balance; exploring feelings associated with achieving WLB; identifying strategies for performing multiple roles; and examining significant differences in WLB based on profiles.*

*The research utilized a mixed-methods approach with a sequential explanatory design and purposive sampling, targeting middle-level managers and teachers in four selected SUCs in Region III. The triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of work-life balance.*

*Findings reveal a diverse profile of respondents, with the majority being middle-aged, female, married, holding MA/MS degrees, and designated as program heads/chairs/coordinators. The overall WLB is characterized as borderline, with elements like family, self, work, and personal satisfaction receiving a neutral level of priority. Respondents define WLB as achieving equilibrium through time management, equal prioritization, and satisfaction in both work and personal life.*

*The study concludes that participants often experience stress and guilt while striving for WLB, employing Smart Planning through proper time management, prioritization, and task delegation. While there is no significant difference in WLB based on most demographic profiles, variations exist in certain elements.*

**Keywords: Work-Life Balance, Middle-level Managers and Teachers, Mixed-Method**

## INTRODUCTION

Work-life balance (WLB) represents an equilibrium in allocating equal importance to various life aspects, as recognized in the 2017 World Happiness Report of the United Nations. Particularly challenging for individuals juggling multiple roles, such as productive, reproductive, and community roles, WLB disparities, especially for women, have been acknowledged, emphasizing the "double burden" of unrecognized and unpaid labor (ILO, 2019). Amid the constitutional affirmation of labor as a pivotal socioeconomic force, various government initiatives, such as the "Expanded

Maternity Leave," "Telecommuting Act," and "Condensed Work Week" bills, aim to foster a balanced work-life dynamic.

In the context of Central Luzon State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) with 11,876 teachers, middle-level managers and teachers collectively fulfill crucial functions, contributing to organizational objectives. Teachers, as leaders, play diverse roles, ranging from instructional specialists to catalysts for change (Harrison and Killion, 2007). However, these multifaceted roles, coupled with family duties, pose significant challenges to achieving WLB, potentially leading to consequences like Work-Life Conflict and burnout (Metz et al., 2014).

Disturbingly, the World's Largest Teacher Burnout Survey (Anthony, 2018) underscores the widespread issues, with over 50% of teachers reporting 'unsustainable' working hours and various health concerns. The Canadian Teachers' Federation Survey further emphasizes the struggle, with 93% of 8,096 teachers torn between teaching and home

Given these alarming findings and recognizing the existence of a double standard in WLB influenced by gender differences and stereotypes (Wolfe, 2019), a gender-based approach becomes imperative. The study "Exploring the

responsibilities.

Gender Perspective Work-Life Balance of State Universities and Colleges' Middle-Level Managers and Teachers" aims to investigate and personalize WLB provisions in response to the diverse needs of men and women in the academic setting.

Specifically, this research sought to answer the following objectives: determine the demographic profile of the respondents, assess the work-life balance (WLB) of the respondents according to its elements: family; the self (rest, health, and recreation); work; and work and personal satisfaction; define work-life balance; discover the respondents' feeling as they struggle to have a work-life balance; describe how respondents perform multiple roles to achieve work-life balance; and determine the significant difference in the work-life balance of the respondents when grouped according to demographic profile.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used mixed-method research that involves collecting, analyzing, and integrating quantitative (e.g., experiments, surveys) and qualitative (e.g., focus groups, interviews) procedures. A quantitative approach was applied in gathering more precise and quantifiable information on the demographic profile, work-life balance (WLB) of the respondents, and its elements. Whereas, the qualitative methodology particularly the sequential explanatory was used in getting the data directly from the respondents themselves. Their views, perceptions, and expectations were given in a detailed manner on how they define WLB, their feelings as they struggle to have WLB, and the ways in which they manage to perform multiple roles to achieve WLB.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

### 1. Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the profile of middle-

level managers and teachers

**Table 1**

*Respondents' Profile*

Profile					
Age	f	%	Highest Educational Attainment	f	%
21-29	25	15.34	BA/BS	14	8.59
30-38	35	21.47	BA/BS with MA/MS units	23	14.11
39-47	52	31.90	MA/MS	52	31.90
48-56	40	24.54	MA/MS with EdD/PhD units	30	18.40
57-65	11	6.75	EdD/PhD	44	26.99
$\bar{x} = 42$					
Sex	f	%	Designation	f	%
Male	69	42.33	Others	44	26.99
Female	94	57.67	Adviser Student Council	12	7.36
			Adviser Student Publication	2	1.23
			Unit/Office Chair/Coor.	23	14.11
Civil Status	f	%	Prog. Head/Chair/Coor.	f	%
Single	49	30.06	Dean/Asst. Dean	15	9.20
Married	103	63.19	Director	9	5.52
Separated	2	1.23			
Solo Parent	6	3.68			
Widow	3	1.84			
<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The majority of the respondents, with a mean age of 42, fall within the middle-age range (39 to 47 years old), suggesting a cohort in their productive years with assumed peak emotional intelligence. In terms of sex, 57.67% of respondents are female, surpassing the 42.33% of male respondents. Regarding civil status, 63.19% of respondents are married, majority (31.90%) have completed their MA degree, 35.58% hold managerial roles as program head/chair/coordinator.

**2. Work-Life Balance Assessment**

The following tables present the assessment of the WLB of the respondents as to the elements: family, self, work, and work and personal satisfaction (WPS).

**2.1 Family**

Table 2 shows the WLB of the respondents as to Family.

**Table 2**

*WLB of the Respondents as to Family*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Do you use all of your vacation days and personal days each year?	2.74	1.28	Poor
2. Do you feel you are missing out on the things that mean the most to you?	3.09	1.06	Borderline
3. Do you bring work home with you?	2.84	1.10	Poor
4. Do you reply to texts while in the company of others?	2.58	0.94	Poor
5. Do you miss special family events?	3.22	0.97	Borderline
6. Do you feel you don't have time for your family?	3.42	1.01	Borderline
7. Do you feel guilty because you can't make time for things outside of work?	3.21	0.99	Borderline
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>Borderline</b>

Legend: 4.00 – 5.00 Good; 3.00 – 3.9 Borderline; 0 – 2.9 Poor

Respondents generally perceive their work-life balance, particularly in the family domain, as borderline (M=3.01, SD=0.62). The highest mean, indicating borderline balance, is associated with feeling time constraints for family (Fam6, M=3.42, SD=1.01), whereas the lowest mean, signifying poor balance, is linked to responding to texts in the presence of others (Fam4, M=2.58, SD=0.94).

**2.2 The Self**

Table 3 shows the WLB of the respondents as to the Self.

**Table 3**

*WLB of the Respondents as to the Self*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Do you feel that you never have a chance to catch your breath before you have to move on to the next project/crisis?	3.21	0.99	Borderline
2. Do you take at least one consecutive full week of vacation each year?	2.71	1.47	Poor
3. Do you work more than one hour per day while on vacation?	2.87	1.27	Poor

Exploring the Gender Perspective Work-Life Balance of State Universities and Colleges' Middle-Level Managers and Teachers

4. Do you dedicate time to having lunch each day (versus multitasking while you eat or skip lunch)?	3.69	0.99	Borderline
5. Do you reserve at least 30 minutes of "me time" each day?	3.77	1.05	Borderline
6. Do thoughts of work interrupt a good night's rest?	3.12	0.99	Borderline
7. Do you feel that your personal needs are secondary?	3.01	1.01	Borderline
8. Do you feel you spend too much time reacting and too little time thinking?	3.50	1.00	Borderline
9. Do you hire people in your personal life to handle some of your chores such as yard work and other home tasks?	2.46	1.31	Poor
10. Do you squeeze every bit of productivity you can out of each day?	2.57	1.11	Poor
11. Do you experience actions at least monthly that allows you to de-stress and rebuild your energy?	3.25	1.04	Borderline
12. Do you take time off from work and do fun activities?	3.15	1.07	Borderline
13. Do you work more than you think is reasonable?	2.62	0.78	Poor
14. Do you read and finish at least one book for pleasure every 6 months?	2.19	1.10	Poor
15. Do you find time to exercise, eat properly, and keep yourself healthy?	3.15	1.01	Borderline
16. Do you feel relaxed and comfortable when you are at home?	4.20	0.84	Good
17. Do you get adequate sleep most nights?	3.38	0.97	Borderline
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>Borderline</b>

Legend: 4.00 – 5.00 Good; 3.00 – 3.9 Borderline; 0 – 2.9 Poor

Table 3 reveals that respondents perceive their work-life balance in the domain of Self as borderline (M=3.11, SD=0.44). Notably, feeling relaxed and comfortable at home (Self16, M=4.20, SD=0.84) is considered indicative of a good work-life balance, while reading and finishing books for pleasure every six months (Self14, M=2.19, SD=1.10) is regarded as a poor work-life balance indicator.

2.3 Work

Table 4 shows the WLB of the respondents as to Work.

**Table 4**

*WLB of the Respondents as to Work*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Do you frequently delegate work to others?	2.75	0.94	Poor
2. Do you look forward to starting your day each morning?	4.29	0.74	Good
3. Do you feel boxed in; that is, you do what you do because others depend on you for support?	2.93	1.07	Poor
4. Do you feel that you are reasonably in control over your workday?	3.55	0.83	Borderline
5. Are you impatient and short with your coworkers or your family?	3.74	0.95	Borderline
6. Do you start your day tired?	3.64	1.03	Borderline
7. Do you have a hard time saying "no" to requests at work?	2.69	0.88	Poor
8. Do you prioritize your to-do list each day and especially focus on your highest priority items?	3.82	0.91	Borderline
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>Borderline</b>

Legend: 4.00 – 5.00 Good; 3.00 – 3.9 Borderline; 0 – 2.9 Poor

As reflected in Table 4, respondents perceive their work-life balance in the context of work as borderline (M=3.43, SD=0.41), with a notable positive indicator being the anticipation of starting each day (Work2, M=4.29, SD=0.74). Conversely, struggling to decline work requests (Work7, M=2.69, SD=0.88) is considered a poor work-life balance indicator, highlighting challenges in setting boundaries at work.

2.4 Work and Personal Satisfaction

Table 5 presents the WLB of the respondents as to Work and Personal Satisfaction.

**Table 5**

*WLB of the Respondents as to Work and Personal Satisfaction*

Exploring the Gender Perspective Work-Life Balance of State Universities and Colleges'  
Middle-Level Managers and Teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Do you feel that you are wasting your time if you are not accomplishing something?	2.36	1.10	Poor
2. Is your work satisfying and rewarding?	3.85	0.90	Borderline
3. Do you feel burnt out, exhausted, and unable to give your all to any area of your life?	3.23	0.92	Borderline
4. Are you satisfied with where you are at this point in the journey of your business life?	3.68	1.03	Borderline
5. Are you satisfied with where you are at this point in the journey of your personal life?	3.78	1.04	Borderline
6. Is clutter building in your office and at home?	2.89	1.14	Poor
7. Do you feel stressed out most of the time?	3.23	0.89	Borderline
8. Do you lose sight of who you are and what you're doing?	3.67	0.97	Borderline
9. Do you spend too much time doing things you don't want to do or spending time with people you don't want to?	3.49	1.10	Borderline
10. Do you feel overwhelmed and over-committed?	2.83	1.02	Poor
11. Do you find it hard to relax and just do nothing, even when you are away on holiday?	3.42	1.02	Borderline
12. Do you frequently feel anxious or upset because of what is happening at work?	3.25	0.90	Borderline
13. Are you satisfied with your work-life balance?	3.62	0.83	Borderline
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>Borderline</b>

Legend: 4.00 – 5.00 Good; 3.00 – 3.9 Borderline; 0 – 2.9 Poor

The respondents perceive their work-life balance in terms of Work and Personal Satisfaction (WPS) as borderline (M=3.33, SD=0.52). The highest mean indicators, regarding WPS, include finding work satisfying and rewarding (WPS2, M=3.85, SD=0.90) and satisfaction with one's current point in the personal life journey (WPS5, M=3.78, SD=1.04), while feeling unproductive when not accomplishing something (WPS1, M=2.36, SD=1.10) is

considered a poor WLB indicator.

### 2.5 Overall WLB

Table 6 shows the WLB of the respondents based on the four (4) elements.

**Table 6**

*Overall WLB of the Middle-level Managers and Teachers*

Elements	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Family	3.01	0.62	Borderline
Self	3.11	0.44	Borderline
Work	3.43	0.41	Borderline
WPS	3.33	0.52	Borderline
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>Borderline</b>

Legend: 4.00 – 5.00 Good; 3.00 – 3.9 Borderline; 0 – 2.9 Poor

In summary, the respondents' overall Work-Life Balance is perceived as borderline (Mean=3.22, SD=0.42), aligning with the individual elements related to Family (Mean=3.01, SD=0.62), Self (Mean=3.11, SD=0.44), Work (Mean=3.43, SD=0.41), and Work and Personal Satisfaction (Mean=3.33, SD=0.52).

### 3. Work-Life Balance Defined

Drawing from respondents' definitions, a central theme of "equilibrium" emerged, encapsulating three distinct sub-themes: adept time management, equitable prioritization, and the pursuit of satisfaction in both work and personal life. In essence, WLB is characterized as an intricate equilibrium, demanding skillful time management, fair prioritization, and the attainment of satisfaction in both professional and personal spheres.

### 4. Respondents' Feelings as They Struggle with Work-Life Balance

The participants express profound stress and remorse as they grapple with the challenges of achieving a work-life balance. Overwhelming exhaustion and a pervasive sense of guilt accompany their efforts to fulfill all duties and responsibilities both at home and in the workplace. These adverse emotions

intensify when participants strive to catch up on missed family obligations post-work or address work left undone due to prioritizing the essential needs of their family members. Amidst their experiences, the recurring terms "exhaustion" and "guilt feeling" emerge as the predominant expressions among participants, encapsulating the depth of their emotional struggles

5. Strategies to Perform Multiple Roles to Achieve Work-Life Balance

Participants emphasized the importance of "proper time management," "prioritization," and "delegation of tasks," culminating in the overarching theme of "smart planning." Smart planning involves crafting detailed schedules, prioritizing tasks based on importance and urgency, and delegating responsibilities to capable colleagues, enabling most respondents to effectively manage both home and work responsibilities. In challenging situations, such as a family member falling ill concurrently with a crucial work task, participants often prioritize family, take leaves of absence, and delegate tasks, expressing a sense of guilt and disappointment for missed quality time across family, personal, and professional aspects. This underscores the enduring significance of family, affirming its primacy even in difficult circumstances. To alleviate stress, many participants engage.

6. Significant Difference in the Work-Life Balance of the Respondents when Grouped according to Profile

6.1 Age

Table 7 below presents the significant difference in the WLB of the respondents when grouped according to age.

**Table 7**

*Significant Differences in the Work-life Balance in Terms of Age*

Elements	Age	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Family	21-29	3.07	0.46	1.19	0.32	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-38	3.04	0.65				
	39-47	2.93	0.63				
	48-56	2.97	0.66				
	57-65	3.35	0.54				
Self	21-29	3.08	0.37	1.25	0.29	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-38	3.13	0.48				
	39-47	3.03	0.44				
	48-56	3.14	0.48				
	57-65	3.34	0.33				
Work	21-29	3.39	0.39	2.76	0.03	Rejected	Significant
	30-38	3.43	0.39				
	39-47	3.32	0.34				
	48-56	3.51	0.52				
	57-65	3.72	0.29				
Work and Personal Satisfaction	21-29	3.26	0.46	2.02	0.09	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-38	3.38	0.48				
	39-47	3.24	0.49				
	48-56	3.37	0.58				
	57-65	3.69	0.55				
Overall	21-29	3.20	0.30	2.20	0.07	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-38	3.25	0.45				
	39-47	3.13	0.39				
	48-56	3.25	0.47				
	57-65	3.52	0.36				

Significant at .05

The Levene's Test results suggest homogeneity of variance, validating the appropriate application of ANOVA. The analysis indicates no significant difference in respondents' average WLB responses based on age, family, self, and work and personal satisfaction. However, there is evidence supporting a significant difference in the average responses concerning work, with a post hoc analysis revealing the distinction between the 39 to 47 years old group (Mean=3.32, SD=0.34) and the 57 to 65 years old group (Mean=3.72, SD=0.29) in wellness activities, including Zumba, workouts, and gardening, highlighting proactive approaches to enhancing their overall well-being.

6.2 Sex

Table 8 below presents the significant difference in the WLB of the respondents when grouped according to sex.

**Table 8**

*Significant Differences in the WLB in Terms of Sex*

Exploring the Gender Perspective Work-Life Balance of State Universities and Colleges' Middle-Level Managers and Teachers

Elements	Sex	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	terpretation
Family	Male	3.13	0.50	2.22	0.03	Rejected	Significant
	Female	2.93	0.68				
Self	Male	3.20	0.37	2.37	0.02	Rejected	Significant
	Female	3.04	0.48				
Work	Male	3.51	0.46	2.19	0.03	Rejected	Significant
	Female	3.37	0.37				
Work and Personal Satisfaction	Male	3.44	0.48	2.43	0.02	Rejected	Significant
	Female	3.25	0.53				
Overall	Male	3.32	0.35	2.73	0.01	Rejected	Significant
	Female	3.15	0.45				

Significant at .05

The Independent Sample t-test results reveal a significant difference in respondents' average WLB responses based on sex, with p-values less than 0.05 for Family, Self, Work, and Work and Personal Satisfaction. This difference is confirmed by the overall response, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (t=2.73, p=0.01).

6.3 Civil Status

Table 9 shows the significant difference in the WLB of the respondents when grouped according to civil status

Table 9

Significant Differences in the WLB in Terms of Civil Status

Elements	Civil Status	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Family	Single	3.05	0.57	0.17	0.95	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.00	0.66				
	Separated	3.14	1.01				
	Solo Parent	2.86	0.29				
	Widow	3.05	0.16				
Self	Single	3.11	0.41	0.49	0.74	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.10	0.47				
	Separated	3.26	0.71				
	Solo Parent	3.05	0.22				
	Widow	3.43	0.27				
Work	Single	3.41	0.45	0.84	0.50	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.42	0.40				
	Separated	3.69	0.80				
	Solo Parent	3.38	0.32				
	Widow	3.79	0.29				
Work and Personal Satisfaction	Single	3.29	0.52	1.81	0.13	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.33	0.51				
	Separated	3.65	0.92				
	Solo Parent	3.26	0.18				
	Widow	4.05	0.39				
Overall	Single	3.21	0.41	0.76	0.55	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.21	0.43				
	Separated	3.44	0.86				
	Solo Parent	3.13	0.12				
	Widow	3.58	0.26				

Significant at .05

There is insufficient evidence to suggest a

significant difference in respondents' average WLB based on civil status (F=0.76, p=0.55), as the p-value exceeds the alpha of 0.05, leading to the retention of the null hypothesis. Similarly, no noteworthy differences are found in respondents' average perceptions among the elements, as indicated by p-values exceeding the alpha level (F=0.17, p=0.95; F=0.49, p=0.74; F=0.84, p=0.50; F=1.81, p=0.13).

Table 10 reveals no significant difference in the average response of respondents regarding WLB based on their highest educational attainment (F=0.52, p=0.72), and similarly, no significant differences are found in the average responses related to the four elements, as indicated by p-values greater than the alpha level of 0.05, leading to the failure to reject the null hypothesis in each case.

6.4 Designation

Table 11 shows the significant difference in the WLB of the respondents when grouped according to designation.

Table 11

Significant Differences in the WLB in Terms of Designation

Elements	Designation	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Family	Others	3.04	0.66	0.83	0.55	Accepted	Not Significant
	Adviser Student Council	3.06	0.49				
	Adviser Student Publication	2.79	0.30				
	Unit/Office Chair/Coor.	3.00	0.49				
	Prog. Head/Chair/Coor.	2.92	0.70				
	Dean/Asst. Dean	3.30	0.45				
Self	Director	3.08	0.55	0.42	0.86	Accepted	Not Significant
	Others	3.08	0.49				
	Adviser Student Council	3.20	0.32				
	Adviser Student Publication	3.00	0.67				
	Unit/Office Chair/Coor.	3.08	0.44				
	Prog. Head/Chair/Coor.	3.08	0.47				
Work	Dean/Asst. Dean	3.25	0.29	2.20	0.04	Rejected	Significant
	Director	3.16	0.46				
	Others	3.34	0.44				
	Adviser Student Council	3.43	0.58				
	Adviser Student Publication	3.44	0.09				
	Unit/Office Chair/Coor.	3.45	0.36				
Work	Prog. Head/Chair/Coor.	3.38	0.32	2.20	0.04	Rejected	Significant
	Dean/Asst. Dean (LSD)	3.66	0.32				
	Director	3.74	0.63				
	Others	3.34	0.58				

Exploring the Gender Perspective Work-Life Balance of State Universities and Colleges' Middle-Level Managers and Teachers

Work and Personal Satisfaction	Adviser Student Council	3.35	0.58	0.96	0.45	Accepted	Not Significant
	Adviser Student Publication	2.96	0.05				
	Unit/Office Chair/Coor.	3.40	0.52				
	Prog. Head/Chair/Coor.	3.24	0.46				
	Dean/Asst. Dean	3.49	0.41				
	Director	3.51	0.57				
Overall	Others	3.20	0.46	1.13	0.35	Accepted	Not Significant
	Adviser Student Council	3.26	0.45				
	Adviser Student Publication	3.05	0.25				
	Unit/Office Chair/Coor.	3.23	0.37				
	Prog. Head/Chair/Coor.	3.16	0.41				
	Dean/Asst. Dean	3.42	0.32				
Director	3.37	0.45					

Significant at .05

Table 11 reveals no significant difference in the average response of respondents regarding work-life balance based on their designation, including Family ( $F=0.83$ ,  $p=0.55$ ), Self ( $F=0.42$ ,  $p=0.86$ ), and work and personal satisfaction ( $F=0.96$ ,  $p=0.45$ ), as the p-values exceed the alpha of 0.05. However, a significant difference is found in the assessment of work-life balance concerning Work ( $F=2.20$ ,  $p=0.04$ ), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Subsequent post hoc analysis using the LSD test identifies a notable difference between the Dean/Asst. Dean (Mean=3.66,  $SD=0.32$ ) and Directors (Mean=3.74,  $SD=0.63$ ) groups compared to the Others (Mean=3.34,  $SD=0.44$ ) and Prog. Head/Chair/Coor (Mean=3.38,  $SD=0.32$ ) groups.

## DISCUSSIONS

### 1. Profile of the Respondents

In middle age, individuals, as noted by Weller and Gould (2017), often excel in their work, demonstrating heightened emotional intelligence, as suggested by studies such as Schwandt (2013) and Hartshorne and Germiné (2015), who indicate the ability to read emotional states, particularly through the eyes,

during the 40s and 50s. Females dominated male respondents, aligning with global trends such as the International Labor Organization's report on women occupying 50% of middle management positions (Bolton, 2015) and a study reporting 51.86% female teachers in Philippine tertiary education (2017). Most respondents are married, reflecting a social need for love and belongingness (Maslow's hierarchy), consistent with a study by Muthulakshimi (2018) where 70% of teaching professionals were married. On educational attainment, the majority have met the minimum requirement for faculty positions (MC No. 17, s. 2013). Yet, some respondents still hold bachelor's degrees, contrasting with the findings of Memo (2017) study on working women in education. Concerning designations, 35.58% hold managerial roles, indicating trust from the school administration. Vandana's (2013) study, focusing on faculty ranks, highlights the diverse roles held by respondents beyond teaching assignments.

### 2. Work-Life Balance Assessment

Respondents in the study indicate a borderline WLB concerning time spent on their families, with evident struggles related to quality time, especially during family illnesses. Despite busy schedules, participants prioritize family time, finding it crucial for feelings of safety, security, and emotional/moral support. The scattered attention between family and work obligations is highlighted, leading to the inevitable act of replying to text messages in the presence of others due to multifaceted responsibilities. These findings resonate with broader societal perspectives on family values, as family is seen as a source of love, security, and happiness, aligning with the USAPHO Foundation (2018) and MLC (2017). The survey by Pew Research Center (2013) reinforces these findings, indicating that a significant percentage of respondents



have made sacrifices in their professional lives, such as reducing hours, declining promotions, or quitting jobs, to fulfill family caregiving responsibilities.

They view their homes as sanctuaries, choosing to return there after work for rest and relaxation, emphasizing the sentiment that "There is no place like home." However, the lack of time for reading entertainment books, possibly due to the nature of their work, implies a focus on professional literature and designated responsibilities. The discussion underscores the importance of rest, good sleep, and leisure activities for overall well-being, aligning with research emphasizing the benefits of proper sleep, exercise, and personal time for mental agility and task accomplishment (Roth, 2017; Leech, 2018; Gorman, 2018; Warker, 2014; Kristofferson, 2017; Moore, 2015).

The managers and teachers prioritize planning and time management, emphasizing the challenge of balancing teaching with managerial roles and additional functions. While some struggle to decline delegated tasks from superiors, the importance of tools like a "To-do" list is underscored, aiding in prioritization and efficiency (Chansaengsee, 2017). Additionally, the recommendation of practicing meditation for a calm and focused mindset aligns with strategies for enhancing work efficiency (Chansaengsee, 2017).

The findings indicate a borderline work-life balance between work and personal satisfaction, suggesting that respondents prioritize work and personal achievements, deriving a sense of purpose and worthiness from fulfilling their obligations. However, dissatisfaction arises when idle, implying a lower priority for rest and recreation. Mya (2019) emphasizes the importance of purpose, positivity, variety, and self-awareness for achieving personal satisfaction in work and home life, noting that inner satisfaction is

crucial and attainable through personal development.

As a summary of the respondents' work-life balance is perceived as borderline, signaling a need for proactive measures before the situation worsens (Marmol, 2019). This aligns with the opportunity to achieve a positive work-life balance, potentially enhancing job satisfaction and productivity (Kamran et al., 2014; Abioro et al., 2018). The present study's findings mirror those of Marmol (2019), emphasizing the moderate perception of work-life balance among teachers, albeit utilizing a different framework. Additionally, consistent with Memon et al. (2017), strong correlations exist between work-life balance and family satisfaction, work satisfaction, and overall satisfaction.

### 3. Work-Life Balance Defined

Work-life balance necessitates thoughtful prioritization and contentment across all life domains (Delecta, 2011). This equilibrium involves skillfully allocating time to each facet of life, avoiding the manifestation of challenges in one domain affecting another. It is essential to acknowledge that conflicts between work and family, family and work, and the neglect of self-care can disrupt this delicate equilibrium, leading to an imbalance in one's overall well-being.

### 4. Respondents' Feelings as They Struggle with Work-Life

Balance Respondents articulated the challenges of exhaustion stemming from their myriad roles, the demanding workload, and the concurrent responsibilities within their families (Ross et al., 2014). A common sentiment among participants was the wish for more than 24 hours in a day, reflecting the perceived inadequacy of time to balance work and personal affairs adequately. The remorse expressed by respondents for bringing work home underscores the struggle to allocate time to family matters, household responsibilities, and personal needs (Ross et al., 2014). This imbalance has palpable repercussions, with stress and guilt infiltrating both work and home environments,

contributing to negative emotions in both spheres (Borelli et al., 2017).

5. Strategies to Perform Multiple Roles to Achieve Work-Life Balance Consistent with Pasay-an et al. (2014),

participants in the present study emphasized strategies for achieving work-life balance, such as setting priorities to prevent personal tasks from clashing with work obligations. Adhering to a planned schedule emerged as a crucial factor, reflecting the significance of structured time management to navigate the complexities of fulfilling multiple roles without complicating or overlapping responsibilities (Pasay-an et al., 2014).

6. Significant Difference in the Work- Life Balance of the Respondents when Grouped according to Profile

6.1 Age

The difference in the work-life balance of the respondents particularly to age groups 39-47 and 57-65 could be linked to their personal and professional life. The former age groups are more stressed in balancing their personal needs and professional endeavor as well as the responsibilities at work which require much energy and attention brought by the challenges of promotion. While the latter age group, respondents are already stable in terms of family, personal and professional life, have retirement plans as well.

Previous studies have shown that age has no significant relationship on the level of attitudes towards work-life balance (Muthulakshimi, 2018), it has no significant difference on the dimensions of work interference with personal life, personal life interference with work, and work-personal life enhancement (Irfan et.al, 2015). However, the study of

Bhandari et. al (2015), which has almost the same age group as the present study, found out that their respondents aged 35-54 focused on their interpersonal relations, experienced more stress, and started questioning the company's policy. They have less satisfaction because in that period they evaluate their early goals and their present achievements. Whereas employees age 55 and above, are in exit mode (at retirement age); have resolved their conflict with balancing their personal needs and professional requirements; and have entered a new stage of stability and fulfillment.

Similarly, the study on the work-life balance among nurse educators towards quality life found that Work Interference to Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference to Work (PLIW) have no significant difference in age. Only variable Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) was found to have a significant difference in age (Pasay-an, 2014). They explained that individuals in midlife have the most work-life balance issues to deal with as they struggle to balance a strong desire for career advancement with major family responsibilities.

6.2 Sex

The observed disparity in the work-life balance between male and female respondents is attributed to gender roles, with men generally reporting higher work- life balance. Women respondents, burdened by home and family responsibilities alongside their professional duties, often lack personal time compared to their male counterparts. This aligns with previous studies where women, even without young children at home, juggle multiple roles, making it challenging to find time for recreation and social activities (Emslie et al., 2009; Delina et al., 2013).

6.3 Civil Status

The findings suggest that civil status does not exert a significant influence on the work-life

balance of the respondents. Despite variations in civil status, all participants share a common professional nature as teachers with additional responsibilities. Notably, some single respondents assume roles traditionally associated with married, separated, solo parent, and widow respondents, serving as caregivers and providers for their families. This aligns with previous research that also indicated the lack of a substantial correlation between civil or marital status and work-life balance (Panisoara, 2012; Vandana, 2013).

#### 6.4 Highest Educational Attainment

The findings underscore that the WLB of respondents remains consistent across different levels of highest educational attainment, suggesting that the highest degree earned does not serve as a distinguishing factor in how individuals manage their work-life balance. In contrast, Zheng et al. (2015) underscored the moderating effects of age on employee health and well-being in their exploration of individual and organizational work-life balance strategies. It is conceivable that the absence of a significant relationship between educational attainment and work-life balance in the current study may stem from its primary focus on comparing work-life balance according to various profiles rather than treating it as a variable for assessing significant relationships.

#### 6.5 Designation

The findings reveal the disparity in WLB among respondents, particularly with Dean/Asst. Dean and Directors reporting better WLB in terms of work compared to Others and Program Head/Chair/Coor, suggests that hierarchical positions with office staff and subordinates may contribute to improved work-life balance ( $F=2.20$ ,  $p=0.04$ ). This aligns with Vandana et al.'s (2013) findings, emphasizing the direct and significant impact of teachers' designations

on the quality of work-life balance. The study implies that those with leadership roles, such as Dean/Asst. Dean and Directors, may benefit from organizational support and assistance, leading to a more favorable work-life equilibrium compared to those working independently in roles like Program Head/Chair/Coor and Others.

#### Triangulation of Quantitative and Qualitative Data

The quantitative data reveals that respondents maintain a "borderline" work-life balance, reflecting their struggle to address elements such as family, self-care, work, and satisfaction. This aligns with qualitative insights, where participants emphasize the importance of achieving equilibrium through balancing time, equal prioritization, and satisfying both work and personal aspects. Despite workload challenges, respondents, especially those in roles like Dean/Asst. Dean and Directors, are committed to maintaining a balance, challenging the Four-Burner Theory. Stress is prominent among females, those aged 39-47, and specific designations like

#### Program

Head/Chair/Coordinator, with exhaustion attributed to heavy workloads. The experience of guilt aligns with the Work/Family Border Theory and Spillover-crossover Model Theory. To mitigate these challenges, respondents adopt "smart planning," incorporating proper time management, prioritization, and task delegation, recognizing its importance in achieving effective work-life balance.

#### CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were drawn in light of the findings:

##### 1. Profile of the Respondents

In this study, the profile analysis revealed that the majority of respondents fall within the middle-age bracket, indicating a predominance of females, with a significant portion being married. Additionally, more

than half of the participants hold Master's degrees, and a considerable number are designated as program heads/chairs/coordinators.

## 2. Work-Life Balance Assessment

The assessment of work-life balance among respondents indicates a borderline status, with the four key elements—family, self (rest, health, and recreation), work, and work and personal satisfaction—all positioned at the midpoint of the scale.

## 3. Work-life Balance Defined

The conceptualization of work-life balance, as derived from participant responses, emphasizes an equilibrium achieved through adept time management, equal prioritization, and the fulfillment of both work and personal needs.

## 4. Respondents' Feelings as They Struggle to Have Work-Life Balance

As participants navigate the challenges of achieving work-life balance, the prevailing sentiment is one of stress and remorse, reflecting the emotional toll associated with this struggle.

## 5. Respondents' Ways to Perform Multiple Roles to Achieve Work-Life Balance

The respondents, in their pursuit of work-life balance, exhibit a strategic approach characterized by "smart planning," reflecting a commitment to efficiently manage multiple roles and responsibilities.

## 6. Significant Difference in the WLB of the Respondents when Grouped according to Profile

When categorizing respondents based on age, civil status, highest educational attainment, and designation (with exceptions noted under the work element for the age group 39-47), no significant differences were observed. However, a noteworthy distinction emerged when grouping respondents by sex.

[1] Creswell, J.W. (2009), *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009.

[2] Fraenkel & Wallen (2005). *Research Methodology*. McGraw Hill. New York., Revised 2010

### (Journal articles)

[4] Abioro, M. A., Oladejo, D. A., & Ashogbon, F.O., (2018), *Work-Life Balance Practices and Employees'*

*Productivity in the Nigerian University System*, Crawford Journal of Business and Social Sciences (CJBASS) Volume VIII No. II September 2018 pp 49-59 ISSN 2141-9094,

<https://cjbasscru.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/>

[5] Arif, B. & Farooqi, Y.A. (2014), *Impact of Work-Life Balance on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among University Teachers: A Case Study of University of Gujrat, Pakistan*, International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Engineering, Vol. 5, No. 9, September 2014, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication> n, Retrieved: 28 June 2019

[6] Baltes, B. & Clark, M. (2009), *Work- Life Balance: The Roles of Work- Family Conflict and Work-Family Facilitation*, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication> n/ Retrieved: 18 April 2019

[7] Bhandari, K., & Soni, H. (2015), I, IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 17, Issue 3.Ver. II (Mar. 2015), PP 48-53 [www.iostjournals.org](http://www.iostjournals.org)

[8] Borelli, Jessica L., Coffey S. K.N., River L. M., Birken, S. A. & Racusin, C. M. (2017), *Bringing Work Home: Gender and Parenting Correlates of Work-*

## REFERENCES

- Family Guilt among Parents of Toddlers*, J Child Fam Stud (2017) 26:1734–1745, DOI 10.1007/s10826-017-0693-9, <http://www.katherinenelsoncoffey.com/uploads/>
- [9] Brown, K., & Bradley L., *Working Time Arrangements and Recreation: Making Time for Weekends When Working Long Hours*, Australian Bulletin of Labour Volume 36 Issue 2, 2010, <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary>, Retrieved: 19 April 2019
- [10] Chansaengsee, S. (2017), *Time Management for Work-Life and Study- Life Balance*, *Veridian E-Journal*, Silpakorn University, International (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Arts) Volume 10 Number 5 July - December 2017, ISSN 1906 – 3431,
- [11] Chimote, N.K., & Srivastava, V. (2013), *Work-Life Balance Benefits: From the Perspective of Organizations and Employees*, IUP Journal of Management Research; Hyderabad Vol. 12, Iss. 1, (Jan 2013):. Retrieved: 19 April 2019
- [12] De Ridder, D. (2012), *How to add more "Family" to the Work-Life-Balance? – Family Friendliness in Medical Under- and Postgraduate Studies and the Workplace*, GMS Z Med Ausbild. 2012; 29(2): Doc22. Published online 2012 Apr Retrieved: 18 April 2019.
- [13] Delecta, P. (2011), *Review Article on Work-Life Balance*
- [14] , International Journal of Current Research Vol. 3, Issue, 4, pp.186-189, April 2011, ISSN: 0975-833X, <http://www.journalcra.com> doi:10.21917/ijms.2018.0089, Volume 17, Issue 2.Ver. III (Feb. 2015), PP 01- 11, Retrieved: 18 April 2019

Catheryn C. Panlaqui

---

Exploring the Gender Perspective Work-Life Balance of State Universities and Colleges'  
Middle-Level Managers and Teachers