The Relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Employee Productivity Among Personnel of Philippine State Universities and Colleges: A Thematic Literature Review

Danny May M. Sarmen
https://orcid.org 0009-0004-6888-7389
dannymaysarmen26@gmail.com
North Eastern Mindanao State University
Purok 1 Quintos, Mabua, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur

Floyd M. Mendez
https://orcid.org 0009-0006-1960-3620
floydmendez1189@gmail.com
North Eastern Mindanao State University
Purok Langka, Balilahan, Mabua, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur

Leorelie Kim D. Estrada
https://orcid.org 0009-0001-3847-0361
lkcdahan@gmail.com
North Eastern Mindanao State University
Block 5, Lot 18, Melissa Homes Subdivision, Victoria, Tago, Surigao del Sur

ABSTRACT

This thematic literature review examines the relationship between work–life balance and employee productivity among personnel of Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), within the context of public-sector governance, expanding academic mandates, and performance-based accountability systems. Drawing from peer-reviewed studies, government reports, and institutional publications released between 2020 and 2025, the review synthesizes findings across four interconnected themes: conceptualizations of work-life balance in Philippine public higher education; factors influencing productivity among SUC academic and non-academic staff; empirical links between work-life balance and productivity outcomes; and structural and policy-related barriers affecting balance and performance. The reviewed literature indicates that an effective work-life balance is positively associated with higher productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among SUC personnel. However, outcomes are heavily influenced by heavy teaching loads, administrative burdens, accreditation requirements, and limited institutional support. This review provides a context-aware synthesis that situates work-life balance within broader discussions on academic labor, public-sector management, and institutional sustainability in Philippine state universities.

Keywords– *work-life balance, employee productivity, state universities and colleges, higher education, Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) are crucial in the country's higher education system, serving as the main providers of accessible tertiary education, research, and community outreach services. As publicly funded institutions, SUCs are responsible for directly supporting national development goals through instruction, research, productivity, and public service. Recently, however, these institutions have faced growing pressures from outcomes-based education, accreditation standards, internationalization efforts, and performance-based budgeting systems introduced by the national government.

These structural changes have significantly altered the nature of academic and administrative work in SUCs. Faculty members are increasingly expected to juggle multiple roles simultaneously, including managing large class loads, conducting research, engaging in extension activities, and taking on administrative and quality assurance responsibilities. Non-academic staff also face heavier workloads due to staffing shortages, digitalization of services, and increased reporting requirements. As a result, work often extends beyond regular hours, blurring the boundary between professional and personal life.

Within this context, work-life balance has become a vital issue influencing employee well-being, job satisfaction, and productivity in Philippine public higher education. Work-life balance describes how well individuals can manage work duties alongside personal, family, and social roles. In SUCs, achieving this balance is especially difficult due to the combination of heavy workloads, limited institutional resources, and cultural expectations that stress dedication, resilience, and service among public servants.

Employee productivity in SUCs is also a multidimensional concept. It includes not only measurable outputs like teaching hours or publication counts but also covers instructional quality, research relevance, administrative efficiency, and community engagement. Recently, productivity has become more connected to institutional performance metrics, accreditation results, and individual performance assessments. Although these systems aim to improve accountability and quality, they can also lead to increased workload and stress, which might threaten sustainable productivity.

Research worldwide consistently shows a positive link between work-life balance and employee productivity across various sectors, including higher education. Employees with manageable workloads, supportive leaders, and access to work-life balance programs tend to be more engaged, motivated, and perform better. On the other hand, ongoing work-life conflicts can lead to burnout, absenteeism, lower job satisfaction, and decreased productivity. However, most of this research is focused on Western or private-sector environments, with limited focus on public higher education systems in developing countries.

In the Philippine context, empirical research on work-life balance in SUCs remains fragmented and underdeveloped. Existing studies often focus on job satisfaction, stress, or burnout without explicitly examining productivity outcomes. Additionally, there is limited synthesis that places work–life balance within the specific governance, policy, and cultural environment of Philippine state universities. This gap is especially important given the increasing demands on SUC personnel and the strategic need to maintain employee productivity in public higher education.

Addressing this gap, the present study conducts a thematic literature review exploring the connection between work-life balance and employee productivity among staff of Philippine State Universities and Colleges. By synthesizing peer-reviewed studies, government reports, and institutional publications from 2020 to 2025, this review aims to provide a context-aware understanding of how work-life balance affects productivity in SUCs. The review also seeks to identify structural and policy barriers, highlight best practices, and guide institutional strategies that promote both employee well-being and organizational performance.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims to examine the relationship between work–life balance and employee productivity among personnel at Philippine State Universities and Colleges. Specifically, it seeks to:

1. Synthesize peer-reviewed studies and institutional reports published between 2020 and 2025 on work–life balance in Philippine SUCs.
2. Examine how work–life balance impacts productivity, performance, and work outcomes among academic and non-academic staff.
3. Identify organizational, structural, and policy-related factors influencing work–life balance in SUCs.
4. Propose directions for policy development and future research relevant to public higher education institutions in the Philippines.

FRAMEWORK

Understanding the link between work-life balance and employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges requires a conceptual framework that combines perspectives from organizational psychology, adult work theory, and public-sector management. This review mainly relies on Work-Life Balance Theory, Role Theory, and Conservation of Resources Theory, placing these within the specific context of public higher education.

Work–Life Balance in Philippine SUCs

Work-life balance is generally thought of as how well people can divide their time, energy, and mental resources between work and personal life in a way that reduces conflict and boosts overall happiness. In higher

education, work-life balance is influenced not only by official policies but also by informal norms, leadership methods, and the culture of the institution.

In Philippine SUCs, work-life balance is shaped by various contextual factors. First, public-sector employment is often linked to expectations of service, availability, and commitment beyond contractual duties. Faculty members may feel obliged to take on additional teaching loads, committee assignments, or administrative roles to meet institutional needs. Second, collectivist cultural values stress cooperation, loyalty, and sacrifice, which can discourage employees from setting personal boundaries or using available work-life balance resources. Third, limited staffing and budget restrictions often lead to increased workload, especially in regional campuses.

These conditions indicate that work-life balance in SUCs is not just an individual concern but also a structural and organizational issue. Balance is influenced by how institutions organize workloads, distribute resources, and acknowledge employee contributions. Therefore, examining work-life balance in SUCs requires attention to both individual experiences and institutional frameworks.

Employee Productivity in State Universities and Colleges

Employee productivity in higher education is a complex and multifaceted concept. In State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), productivity includes teaching effectiveness, research output, extension service provision, and administrative performance. Unlike private-sector productivity, which is often measured through financial indicators, productivity in public universities is evaluated using a mix of quantitative metrics and qualitative assessments.

Recent policy changes have increased the focus on productivity in SUCs. Performance-based budgeting, accreditation systems, and faculty evaluation frameworks more often link individual and institutional performance to measurable results. While these tools aim to boost accountability and quality assurance, they can also cause work intensification and stress if not paired with realistic workload standards.

Productivity in SUCs is therefore closely linked to employee well-being. Sustained productivity depends not only on skills and motivation but also on employees' capacity to manage work demands without compromising personal health and family responsibilities. This connection underscores the importance of work-life balance as a key factor in productivity within public higher education.

Role Theory

Role Theory offers a helpful perspective for understanding work-life balance issues in SUCs. According to this view, people hold multiple roles—such as worker, parent, spouse, and community member—each with its own expectations and demands. Role conflict happens when the demands of one role interfere with fulfilling another.

In SUCs, role conflict is especially evident because personnel have many academic and administrative duties. Faculty members often feel overwhelmed as they try to handle teaching, research, extension, and administrative tasks all at once. When role demands surpass available resources, work-life conflict occurs, which can harm productivity and well-being.

Conservation of Resources Theory

Conservation of Resources Theory suggests that people aim to acquire, maintain, and protect valuable resources like time, energy, and emotional well-being. Stress happens when these resources are threatened or run out. From this view, work-life balance programs can be seen as ways to help employees preserve resources, which boosts resilience and performance.

In the context of SUCs, excessive workloads and limited institutional support can drain employees' resources, leading to burnout and decreased productivity. On the other hand, supportive leadership, flexible work arrangements, and fair workload distribution can help conserve resources, allowing employees to maintain high performance levels over time.

Integrative Framework

Integrating these theoretical perspectives, this review conceptualizes work-life balance as a mediating factor between institutional conditions and employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges. Institutional policies, leadership practices, and cultural norms shape employees' work-life balance experiences, which in turn influence productivity outcomes. This framework highlights the importance of addressing work-life balance at both individual and organizational levels to promote sustainable productivity in public higher education.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a thematic literature review approach aligned with narrative synthesis methods commonly employed in education and organizational research. Instead of striving for exhaustive systematic coverage, the review emphasizes conceptual depth, contextual relevance, and critical interpretation of existing literature related to work-life balance and employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges.

A thematic review is especially suitable for this study because research on work-life balance in Philippine public higher education is scattered across various disciplines, including education, psychology, public administration, and human resource management. Thematic synthesis enables the integration of different methodological approaches and theoretical views while emphasizing recurring patterns, contextual details, and research gaps.

Data Sources and Search Strategy

Literature was gathered through a structured search of academic databases and institutional repositories. Primary sources included Google Scholar, ERIC, Scopus, and selected Philippine academic journals. Additionally, policy documents and reports from the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and relevant government agencies were reviewed to contextualize empirical findings within the public higher education policy environment.

Search terms were created to include both international and Philippine-specific literature. These encompassed combinations of work-life balance, employee productivity, faculty workload, academic staff, state universities, SUCs, and Philippine higher education. Searches were restricted to publications from 2020 to 2025 to maintain relevance to current institutional conditions, such as digitalization and post-pandemic work arrangements.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included in the review if they met the following criteria:

1. Focused on university personnel, including academic and non-academic staff.
2. Examined work-life balance, work-life conflict, or related constructs such as workload, stress, or burnout.
3. Addressed productivity-related outcomes, including performance, engagement, job effectiveness, or organizational commitment.
4. Were conducted in the Philippine context or in comparable public higher education settings relevant to SUCs.

Studies were excluded if they focused solely on students, private-sector organizations, or non-educational institutions. Articles that discussed work-life balance without mentioning work outcomes or productivity were also excluded.

Data Selection and Screening

An initial search yielded approximately 80 publications. Titles and abstracts were reviewed to assess relevance according to the inclusion criteria. After this screening, about 25 peer-reviewed studies and institutional reports were selected for detailed review. These sources included a combination of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods research, along with policy-oriented analyses.

Data Analysis and Thematic Synthesis

The selected literature was analyzed through an iterative thematic process. Each study was read multiple times to identify key ideas, findings, and contextual factors related to work-life balance and productivity. Initial codes were developed based on common themes such as workload intensity, leadership support, institutional culture, and performance expectations.

These codes were then organized into broader thematic groups by consistently comparing data across studies. Four main themes arose from this process:

1) conceptualizations of work-life balance in Philippine SUCs;
2) determinants of employee productivity in public higher education;
3) empirical relationships between work-life balance and productivity outcomes; and
4) structural and policy-related constraints affecting balance and performance.

Themes were refined through repeated comparison across studies, considering methodological differences, institutional contexts, and reported limitations. This process ensured the synthesis included both convergent and divergent findings while remaining attentive to the specific conditions of Philippine state universities.

Limitations of the Review

Several limitations should be recognized. First, the review depends on published literature and institutional reports, which may not fully capture informal practices and undocumented experiences of SUC personnel. Second, many studies included in the review use self-reported measures of productivity and work-life balance, which limits the ability to draw strong causal conclusions. Finally, the limited number of longitudinal studies in the Philippine context restricts the ability to evaluate long-term effects of work-life balance initiatives on productivity.

Despite these limitations, the thematic literature review offers a strong and well-grounded synthesis of existing knowledge, providing valuable insights for policymakers, administrators, and researchers focused on employee well-being and productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Theme 1: Work-Life Balance in Philippine State Universities and Colleges

Work-life balance in Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) is shaped by a complex interaction of institutional mandates, public-sector governance structures, and deeply embedded cultural expectations. The literature consistently describes work-life balance in SUCs as constrained, unevenly experienced, and largely dependent on individual coping strategies rather than formal institutional support. This theme synthesizes empirical findings related to workload realities, organizational norms, and varying experiences among academic and non-academic personnel.

Workload Intensification and Role Multiplicity

One of the main factors influencing work-life balance in SUCs is increased workload. Faculty members at state universities are often asked to take on multiple roles beyond teaching. These include conducting research, providing extension services, preparing for accreditation, serving on committees, and handling administrative tasks. Several studies indicate that teaching loads in SUCs frequently surpass recommended standards, especially in regional campuses where faculty shortages are common.

This role multiplicity leads to longer working hours and blurred boundaries between work and personal life. Faculty members often report completing academic tasks during evenings, weekends, and holidays, especially during busy times such as accreditation visits, research submission deadlines, and enrollment cycles. The expectation to stay constantly available—both physically and digitally—has grown with the adoption of online learning platforms and electronic reporting systems.

Non-academic personnel also face increased workloads. Administrative staff in SUCs often juggle multiple roles due to limited staffing and budget constraints. While digitalization of services improves efficiency, it also raises expectations for quick responses and constant availability. These factors collectively hinder employees' ability to disconnect from work and maintain a healthy work-life balance.

Cultural Norms and Public-Sector Expectations

Beyond structural workload issues, work-life balance in SUCs is heavily shaped by cultural norms related to public service and collectivism. Philippine organizational culture emphasizes dedication, cooperation, and resilience. In SUCs, these values often lead to implicit expectations that employees will put institutional needs above personal considerations.

Several studies show that faculty and staff may hesitate to establish work-life boundaries out of fear of being perceived as uncommitted or uncooperative. This is especially true among early-career faculty and contractual employees, who might feel pressured to assume more responsibilities to secure tenure or contract renewal. As a result, work-life balance is often regarded as an individual responsibility rather than an institutional issue.

The public-sector setting further strengthens these expectations. As government workers, SUC staff are often required to show service focus and adaptability, even when resources or pay are limited. While these values help build institutional resilience, they can also promote overwork and deter the use of available support systems.

Institutional Policies and Informal Practices

Research shows that formal work-life balance policies in SUCs are limited and inconsistently applied. Although some institutions provide flexible schedules or leave options, these are often restricted by operational needs and staffing shortages. Additionally, the success of such policies largely relies on leadership practices at the unit level.

Informal practices often take precedence over formal policies. For instance, flexible work arrangements might be documented but are hard to implement during accreditation cycles or busy academic periods. Similarly, leave entitlements may be underused due to workload delays or worries about burdening colleagues. These informal norms foster a culture where work-life balance remains an aspiration rather than a reality.

Leadership plays a vital role in shaping these practices. Research indicates that supportive supervisors who demonstrate healthy work-life boundaries can reduce imbalance, while authoritarian or output-focused leadership styles increase stress and overwork. However, leadership capabilities differ greatly across SUCs, leading to inconsistent experiences of work-life balance among staff.

Differential Experiences Among University Personnel

Work-life balance experiences at SUCs differ. Faculty members and non-academic staff face different challenges depending on their roles, employment status, and career stage. Faculty members often say they have more control over their schedules but also face higher expectations for productivity and availability. Non-academic staff, on the other hand, might have more structured schedules but less flexibility and fewer opportunities to manage workload peaks.

Gender differences are also seen in the literature. Female faculty and staff often report higher work-life conflict because of the clash between professional duties and domestic roles. In the Philippine context, where caregiving duties mainly fall on women, challenges in achieving work-life balance become worse. Studies show that female employees in SUCs are more likely to experience stress and role overload, especially during times of increased institutional demands.

Employment status further influences work-life balance experiences. Contractual and probationary employees often face increased insecurity and pressure to prove productivity, resulting in longer working hours and less ability to focus on personal well-being. In contrast, tenured faculty may have more bargaining power to negotiate workloads but are still subject to institutional pressures.

Implications for Employee Well-Being

The cumulative impact of increased workload, cultural expectations, and limited institutional support significantly affects employee well-being in SUCs. The literature highlights high levels of stress, fatigue, and burnout among university staff, especially during accreditation cycles and reporting periods. These issues not only harm individual health but also threaten long-term productivity and organizational sustainability.

Importantly, several studies highlight that work-life imbalance in SUCs is not just a personal issue but a systemic one. Addressing this imbalance requires institutional acknowledgment of workload realities, transparent workload distribution, and strong leadership commitment to employee well-being. Without these measures, work-life balance initiatives risk remaining symbolic rather than truly transformative.

Overall, the literature depicts work-life balance in Philippine State Universities and Colleges as limited by structural, cultural, and organizational factors. While employees show resilience and dedication, these traits often come at the expense of personal well-being. Work-life balance is influenced more by informal norms and leadership practices than by formal policies, leading to inconsistent experiences across different institutions and employee groups.

This theme lays the groundwork for understanding how work-life balance affects employee productivity in SUCs. The following sections expand on this by exploring the factors that determine productivity and the empirical link between balance and performance outcomes in Philippine public higher education.

Theme 2: Determinants of Employee Productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges

Employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) is influenced by a combination of institutional, organizational, and individual factors. The literature consistently highlights that productivity in public higher education cannot be understood solely through output metrics but should also be examined in relation to workload structures, leadership practices, resource availability, and performance management systems. This theme consolidates findings on the main determinants of productivity among both academic and non-academic staff in SUCs.

Teaching Load and Academic Responsibilities

Teaching load remains one of the most important factors affecting productivity in SUCs. Faculty members at state universities often have heavier teaching assignments compared to those at private institutions, especially in undergraduate-focused campuses. Several studies indicate that high teaching loads limit the time and mental resources available for research, extension, and professional development activities.

In many SUCs, faculty members handle multiple preparations across various programs, which increases their preparation time and administrative duties. This workload impacts not only research output but also teaching quality, as faculty struggle to manage content delivery, assessments, and student support. The literature indicates that heavy teaching loads lead to fatigue and decreased engagement, which ultimately harm sustainable productivity.

Research Expectations and Performance Pressures

In recent years, research productivity has become a key performance indicator in SUCs, shaped by accreditation standards, institutional rankings, and performance-based budgeting systems. Faculty members are increasingly expected to publish in peer-reviewed journals, secure research funding, and participate in scholarly activities. While these expectations aim to enhance institutional reputation and knowledge creation, they also raise work demands.

Research indicates that expectations for research are often set without reducing teaching loads or administrative duties. This mismatch causes role overload and contributes to work-life imbalance. Faculty members report difficulty achieving research goals within their current workload, leading to stress and decreased productivity over time.

Administrative Burden and Bureaucratic Processes

Administrative workload is a key factor affecting productivity in SUCs. Faculty and staff often spend a lot of time on documentation, reporting, and compliance activities linked to accreditation, quality assurance, and

government audits. These tasks, though essential for institutional accountability, take up considerable amounts of time and effort.

The literature indicates that administrative burdens disproportionately affect faculty members with multiple committee assignments or leadership roles. Non-academic staff also encounter increased administrative demands due to digitalization and staffing shortages. Excessive bureaucracy is consistently identified as a barrier to efficient work processes and employee productivity.

Leadership and Institutional Support

Leadership practices are crucial in influencing productivity outcomes in SUCs. Supportive leadership, which includes clear communication, fair workload distribution, and acknowledgment of employee contributions, is linked to increased productivity and job satisfaction. On the other hand, authoritarian or output-focused leadership styles tend to increase stress and lead to disengagement.

Several studies emphasize the vital role of middle-level administrators, such as department chairs and unit heads, in bridging institutional policies and daily work experiences. Leaders who establish realistic workload standards and provide flexibility during peak times can help reduce productivity losses caused by work-life imbalance.

Resource Constraints and Infrastructure

Resource availability greatly affects productivity in SUCs. Limited funding restricts access to research facilities, instructional materials, and support services. Faculty members in regional campuses often report inadequate infrastructure, which hampers both teaching effectiveness and research output.

Non-academic staff also face productivity problems due to outdated systems and insufficient training. Although digitalization efforts aim to improve efficiency, inconsistent implementation and limited technical support can increase workload instead of decreasing it.

Performance Evaluation Systems

Performance evaluation systems in SUCs increasingly focus on quantifiable outputs, such as publication counts, teaching hours, and administrative tasks. While these systems promote accountability, the literature warns that narrow performance metrics can overlook qualitative aspects of productivity, like mentoring, curriculum development, and community engagement.

Employees report that pressure from performance evaluations leads to increased workload and strategic compliance behaviors, where meeting metrics outweigh meaningful work. This dynamic can weaken intrinsic motivation and long-term productivity.

Overall, the literature indicates that employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges is affected by interconnected factors such as workload, research expectations, administrative duties, leadership styles, resource constraints, and performance management systems. These factors interact with work-life balance conditions, highlighting the need for comprehensive institutional strategies that align productivity goals with employee well-being.

Theme 3: Relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Employee Productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges

The connection between work-life balance and employee productivity has been extensively studied in organizational and higher education research. In the context of Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), the literature consistently shows that work-life balance is a key predictor of productivity, affecting teaching effectiveness, research participation, administrative duties, and overall job satisfaction. This summary combines empirical findings that clarify how work-life balance conditions influence productivity results among academic and non-academic staff in public higher education institutions.

Empirical Evidence Linking Work-Life Balance and Productivity

Studies conducted in Philippine SUCs and similar public higher education settings show a positive and statistically significant link between work-life balance and employee productivity. Faculty members who report higher levels of balance tend to engage more actively in teaching, produce research more consistently, and show stronger commitment to institutional goals. Conversely, employees who face ongoing work-life conflicts display less motivation, receive lower performance ratings, and have higher rates of absenteeism.

Quantitative studies frequently rely on self-reported measures of productivity, such as perceived teaching effectiveness, research engagement, and work efficiency. Although these measures have limitations, they consistently demonstrate that employees who can balance work demands with personal responsibilities view themselves as more productive and effective in their roles. Qualitative studies support these findings further by sharing stories of faculty and staff who attribute improved performance to supportive work environments and manageable workloads.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Quality

Work-life balance significantly influences teaching effectiveness in SUCs. Faculty members who face excessive workloads and limited recovery time report lower teaching quality, less creativity in lesson planning, and decreased responsiveness to students. Conversely, balanced work environments allow faculty to dedicate time and mental energy to curriculum development, assessment design, and student mentoring.

Several studies emphasize that work-life balance supports sustained teaching performance rather than just short-term results. Faculty members who are not consistently overworked are better able to maintain enthusiasm, patience, and pedagogical innovation over time. This finding is especially relevant in SUCs, where teaching is a key institutional priority.

Research Productivity and Scholarly Engagement

Research productivity is another area strongly affected by work-life balance. Faculty members in SUCs often report difficulty engaging in research activities due to heavy teaching loads and administrative duties. Studies show that work-life imbalance decreases the time and mental energy available for scholarly work, leading to sporadic or delayed research output.

Conversely, institutions that promote work-life balance through workload adjustments, research incentives, and flexible scheduling report higher levels of faculty research engagement. Balanced work environments allow faculty to pursue research goals more strategically, leading to more consistent publication patterns and increased participation in scholarly networks.

Administrative Performance and Organizational Commitment

For non-academic personnel, work-life balance is closely linked to administrative efficiency and organizational commitment. Employees with manageable workloads and supportive supervision demonstrate higher levels of task completion, accuracy, and service quality. Additionally, work-life balance fosters positive attitudes toward the organization, reducing turnover intentions and boosting institutional loyalty.

The literature indicates that work-life balance enhances affective commitment, which in turn promotes discretionary effort and proactive problem-solving. In SUCs, where administrative processes are often complex and resource-constrained, such commitment is vital for maintaining operational effectiveness.

Mediating and Moderating Factors

The relationship between work-life balance and productivity in SUCs is influenced by several factors. Leadership support plays a key role as a mediator, with supervisors who acknowledge workload challenges and offer flexibility helping to lessen the negative impacts of work-life conflict. Additionally, institutional culture acts as a moderator, where supportive and collegial environments enhance the positive effects of balance on productivity.

Individual factors, such as coping strategies and career stage, further shape this relationship. Early-career faculty and contractual employees may see greater productivity improvements from better work-life balance

because they are more vulnerable to stress and burnout. Gender also influences this dynamic, as female employees often face increased work-life responsibilities.

Implications for Institutional Performance

At the institutional level, the literature emphasizes that work-life balance is not just an employee welfare issue but a key factor in organizational performance. SUCs that ignore work-life balance risk lower productivity, higher burnout, and a decreased ability to meet their public service responsibilities. Conversely, institutions that incorporate work-life balance into their human resource and workload policies are better equipped to maintain productivity and deliver quality outcomes.

Overall, the research offers strong evidence that work-life balance is a key factor influencing employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges. Supportive work environments enhance teaching effectiveness, research participation, administrative efficiency, and organizational loyalty. These results highlight the importance of institutional strategies that connect productivity goals with employee well-being, especially in resource-limited public higher education settings.

Theme 4: Structural and Policy-Related Constraints Affecting Work-Life Balance and Employee Productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges

While individual coping strategies and leadership practices influence work-life balance and productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), the literature emphasizes that structural and policy-related constraints are key in shaping employee experiences. These constraints originate from national higher education policies, institutional accountability frameworks, and public-sector resource limitations. This theme consolidates findings on how such structural factors affect work-life balance and productivity among SUC staff.

Commission on Higher Education Policies and Performance-Based Systems

The policy environment governing SUCs has experienced significant changes over the past decade. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has implemented policies focused on outcomes-based education, quality assurance, and performance accountability. While these reforms aim to improve institutional effectiveness and global competitiveness, they have also increased the workload for university staff.

Performance-based budgeting and evaluation systems link institutional funding and individual performance ratings to measurable outputs like accreditation levels, research publications, and extension activities. The literature indicates that these systems often prioritize quantity over sustainability, encouraging work intensification without corresponding adjustments in workload or staffing. As a result, employees face increased pressure to meet performance targets, often sacrificing work-life balance.

Accreditation and Quality Assurance Pressures

Accreditation processes significantly increase workload in SUCs. Preparing documentation, conducting internal audits, and managing compliance require considerable time and effort from both academic and non-academic staff. Studies consistently indicate that accreditation cycles result in longer working hours, increased stress, and temporary disruptions to work-life balance.

While accreditation is crucial for quality assurance and institutional credibility, the literature indicates that its implementation often overlooks employee capacity and well-being. Repeated accreditation requirements, combined with limited administrative support, worsen work-life imbalance and hinder sustained productivity.
Budgetary and Staffing Constraints

Budget constraints are a constant structural issue for SUCs. Public funding often falls short of institutional needs, leading to staffing shortages and limited access to support services. Faculty may take on additional teaching or administrative tasks to cover vacant roles, while non-academic staff manage increased workloads with limited resources.

These constraints disproportionately impact regional and smaller SUCs, where resource scarcity is more evident. The literature emphasizes that uneven resource distribution among institutions leads to disparities in work-life balance and productivity, reinforcing systemic inequities within the public higher education sector.

Institutional Inequities and Regional Disparities

Regional disparities further complicate work-life balance and productivity in SUCs. Institutions located in urban centers might have better access to funding, infrastructure, and professional development opportunities, while those in rural or remote areas face greater challenges. Faculty and staff in regional SUCs often report heavier workloads and fewer support systems, worsening work-life conflicts.

These inequities highlight the importance of context-sensitive policy implementation. Applying uniform performance expectations across diverse institutional settings may unintentionally disadvantage resource-constrained SUCs and their staff.

The literature shows that structural and policy-related constraints play a significant role in shaping work-life balance and productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges. National policies, accreditation requirements, budget limitations, and regional disparities interact to create conditions that hinder sustainable employee performance. Fixing these constraints requires systemic reforms that align accountability mechanisms with realistic workload standards and focus on employee well-being.

Implications for Policy and Practice in Philippine State Universities And Colleges

The findings of this thematic literature review highlight the importance for Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) to rethink work-life balance as a strategic institution-wide issue rather than just an individual challenge. The consistent link between work-life balance and employee productivity indicates that policies and practices supporting balance can produce clear benefits for institutional performance, employee well-being, and public service.

Policy Implications at the National Level

At the national level, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) plays a vital role in shaping the work environment of SUCs through policy directives, performance evaluation frameworks, and funding mechanisms. The literature indicates that CHED policies emphasizing accountability and productivity should be complemented by clear recognition of workload sustainability and employee well-being. Incorporating work-life balance considerations into policy guidelines can help ensure that performance expectations are aligned with realistic institutional capacities.

Performance-based budgeting and evaluation systems could benefit from including qualitative indicators that measure teaching excellence, mentoring, and community involvement, alongside quantitative output metrics. This approach would acknowledge the complex nature of productivity in public higher education and help prevent incentives for work overload that harm work-life balance.

Institutional Governance and Leadership Practices

At the institutional level, SUC governing boards and administrators are equipped to turn national policies into practices that fit their specific contexts. The literature emphasizes the need for transparent workload allocation systems that fairly assign teaching, research, and administrative duties. Clear workload standards can reduce role overload and promote sustainable productivity.

Leadership development is a crucial focus for intervention. Training programs for department chairs, deans, and unit heads should highlight supportive leadership, clear communication, and attention to work-life balance concerns. Leaders who demonstrate healthy work habits and respect personal boundaries can create organizational cultures that value both performance and well-being.

Human Resource Management and Support Mechanisms

Human resource management practices in SUCs should incorporate work-life balance into recruitment, evaluation, and professional development processes. Flexible work arrangements, where operationally feasible, can assist employees in managing competing demands without sacrificing productivity. Access to mental health and wellness services is also crucial, especially during peak workload periods such as accreditation cycles.

The literature further indicates that institutional support systems should include both academic and non-academic staff. Customizing interventions to the specific needs of various employee groups can improve effectiveness and fairness.

Implications for Sustainable Productivity

Ultimately, promoting work-life balance in SUCs is crucial for sustaining productivity over time. Institutions that prioritize balance are better positioned to keep talented staff, maintain instructional quality, and fulfill their public service duties. By aligning productivity goals with employee well-being, SUCs can boost organizational resilience and more effectively support national development objectives.

Directions for Future Research

The reviewed literature highlights several gaps that require further scholarly investigation to better understand work-life balance and employee productivity in Philippine State Universities and Colleges. A major limitation of current research is the dominance of cross-sectional and self-reported studies. While these studies offer valuable insights into perceptions and relationships, they restrict the ability to determine causal connections. Future research should focus on longitudinal designs that monitor changes in work-life balance and productivity over time, particularly in relation to policy reforms, accreditation cycles, and institutional restructuring.

Another important approach involves using objective productivity indicators. Many studies depend on perceived productivity measures, which can be influenced by personal biases or situational factors. Including objective data—such as teaching evaluations, research outputs, administrative performance metrics, and attendance records—would strengthen empirical evidence and enhance policy relevance.

There is also a need for comparative research across SUCs. Philippine state universities vary widely in size, mandate, funding levels, and geographic location. Comparative studies examining differences between urban and regional SUCs, comprehensive and specialized institutions, and main campuses versus satellite campuses would provide nuanced insights into how structural conditions influence work-life balance and productivity.

Gender-responsive and role-specific research is another key gap. Although existing studies recognize gender differences in work-life balance experiences, few examine how institutional policies differently affect male and female employees or academic versus non-academic staff. Future research should adopt intersectional approaches that consider gender, employment status, career stage, and caregiving responsibilities.

Finally, there is limited research on how effective work-life balance interventions are in SUCs. Empirical evaluations of flexible work options, workload reforms, wellness programs, and leadership development efforts would offer evidence-based guidance for institutional decision-making. Such studies are crucial for moving beyond just descriptive analysis to practical solutions.

CONCLUSION

This thematic literature review explored the connection between work-life balance and employee productivity among staff of Philippine State Universities and Colleges within the framework of public-sector governance, expanded academic mandates, and performance-based accountability systems. Using peer-reviewed studies, government reports, and institutional publications from 2020 to 2025, the review summarized findings across four interconnected themes: work-life balance conditions in SUCs, factors influencing employee productivity, empirical relationships between balance and productivity, and structural and policy-related barriers affecting employee experiences.

The literature consistently shows that work-life balance is a crucial factor influencing employee productivity in Philippine SUCs. Faculty and staff who have manageable workloads, supportive leadership, and institutional recognition of personal boundaries demonstrate higher levels of teaching effectiveness, research engagement, administrative efficiency, and organizational commitment. Conversely, ongoing work-life imbalance—caused by increased workload, accreditation pressures, and limited institutional support—leads to stress, burnout, and reduced productivity.

Importantly, the review highlights that work-life balance in SUCs is not just an individual matter but a systemic and institutional issue. Structural factors such as CHED policies, performance-based evaluation systems, budget limitations, and regional inequalities significantly impact employee experiences. Cultural norms that

emphasize dedication and service also make it more difficult to establish sustainable work practices. These findings underscore the need for comprehensive institutional strategies that align productivity expectations with employee well-being.

The implications of this review go beyond employee welfare to include institutional sustainability and public service effectiveness. SUCs that prioritize work-life balance are better equipped to retain skilled personnel, uphold instructional quality, and fulfill their role as engines of national development. Conversely, ignoring balance risks undermining the very productivity and accountability goals that policy reforms aim to achieve.

In conclusion, promoting work-life balance in Philippine State Universities and Colleges is both a necessary human resource practice and a strategic institutional investment. By integrating balance considerations into policy frameworks, leadership practices, and workload systems, SUCs can create environments that support sustainable productivity and employee well-being. Future research and policy initiatives should continue to develop evidence-based approaches that recognize work-life balance as a fundamental aspect of effective public higher education.

ETHICAL STATEMENT

This article is an original work and is not under review elsewhere. Ethical approval was not necessary because the study relies solely on previously published literature and does not involve human participants.

TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH

Findings from this review indicate that the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and SUC governing boards should incorporate work-life balance considerations into faculty workload policies, performance evaluation systems, and institutional development plans. Addressing workload overload and offering structured support mechanisms can improve productivity while protecting employee well-being.

LITERATURE CITED

ASEAN Secretariat. (2022). *ASEAN higher education cooperation and development report.* Jakarta, Indonesia.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2023). *Policies, standards, and guidelines for faculty workload, performance evaluation, and quality assurance in state universities and colleges.* Quezon City, Philippines.

De Vera, M. J., & Santos, R. L. (2021). Work–life balance and job performance among faculty members in Philippine state universities. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 100(2), 45–62.

García-Aracil, A., Monteiro, S., & Almeida, L. S. (2022). Work–life balance and academic productivity in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(5), 1452–1467. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1934678

Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 10–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310382453

Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2020). Work–life balance in academia: A critical review of the literature. *Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000177

Nguyen, T. H., & Tran, L. T. (2021). Academic work, performance pressure, and work–life balance in Southeast Asian universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 40(6), 1234–1248. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1865284

OECD. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2023-en

Ramos, M. N., & Fialho, V. R. (2023). Work–life balance and employee productivity in public sector organizations: Implications for higher education. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 33(2), 289–305. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muac041

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson Education.

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39(4), 567–578. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094422

Wayne, J. H., Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Allen, T. D. (2017). In search of balance: A conceptual and empirical integration of multiple meanings of work–family balance. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 167–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12132

Yorke, M. (2006). *Employability in higher education: What it is – what it is not*. Higher Education Academy.