

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12426328

# WORK-LIFE BALANCE AND PRODUCTIVITY OF WPU FACULTY ENGAGED IN ACCREDITATION

Jergen Jel A. Cinco- Labaria<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Western Philippines University

Received: 07/09/2025

Accepted: 18/02/2026

Corresponding Author: Jergen Jel A. Cinco- Labaria  
([jergen.labaria@wpu.edu.ph](mailto:jergen.labaria@wpu.edu.ph))

## ABSTRACT

*This study examined the relationship between work-life balance and productivity among higher education faculty members engaged in accreditation activities at Western Philippines University. Grounded in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework, the study assumed that intensified institutional demands during accreditation periods may influence faculty well-being and performance. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed involving 88 faculty members actively participating in accreditation processes. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire measuring four dimensions of work-life balance (personal life, time management, leisure, and stress) and self-reported productivity indicators. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation analysis were used to analyze the data. Results revealed moderate levels of work-life balance ( $M = 3.31, SD = 0.88$ ) and productivity ( $M = 3.30, SD = 0.87$ ). A statistically significant moderate positive relationship was found between work-life balance and productivity ( $r = 0.52, p < 0.01$ ), indicating that faculty members who maintain stronger personal-professional balance demonstrate higher performance during accreditation periods. The findings highlight the importance of institutional workload recognition and faculty wellness initiatives in sustaining both accreditation effectiveness and long-term academic productivity.*

---

**KEYWORDS:** Work-life balance, Faculty productivity, Accreditation, Higher education, Job demands-resources model

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary higher education environment, faculty members are expected to perform multiple and expanding roles that extend beyond traditional teaching and research. These responsibilities increasingly include administrative functions, institutional governance, quality assurance initiatives, and accreditation-related activities. Accreditation has become a central mechanism for ensuring program quality, institutional accountability, and academic credibility. While it strengthens institutional standards, it simultaneously intensifies faculty workload through documentation, curriculum alignment, outcomes assessment, and compliance reporting.

At Western Philippines University (WPU), faculty members involved in accreditation undertake additional responsibilities alongside their regular teaching, research, and service commitments. These expanded duties often require extended working hours, cross-departmental coordination, and sustained attention to institutional benchmarks. The cumulative effect of these demands raises important concerns regarding faculty work-life balance and its potential implications for productivity and well-being.

Work-life balance refers to the ability of individuals to manage professional obligations alongside personal and social roles in a sustainable manner. In higher education settings, persistent imbalance has been associated with emotional exhaustion, reduced job satisfaction, and diminished organizational commitment (Kinman, 2016; Winefield et al., 2020). Conversely, faculty members who maintain healthy work-life boundaries demonstrate stronger engagement, resilience, and instructional effectiveness (Shin & Jung, 2021). These findings suggest that work-life balance functions as a critical personal resource in sustaining academic performance under conditions of heightened institutional demand.

Despite increasing attention to faculty well-being, limited empirical research has specifically examined how accreditation-related workload influences the relationship between work-life balance and productivity. Accreditation processes are often cyclical yet intensive, requiring concentrated effort within defined timelines. Such intensified demands may compress personal time, reduce recovery opportunities, and influence performance outcomes. Understanding how faculty navigate these dual pressures is essential for developing institutional policies that promote both quality assurance and faculty sustainability.

Grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) framework, this study investigates the relationship between work-life balance and productivity among faculty members engaged in accreditation at Western Philippines University. The JD-R model posits that heightened job demands, such as accreditation-related workload, may strain employees unless balanced by sufficient personal and organizational resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Within this framework, work-life balance is conceptualized as a personal resource that may buffer stress and sustain productivity.

### 1.1 Objectives of the Study

This study was conducted to investigate the relationship between work-life balance and productivity among higher education faculty involved in accreditation at Western Philippines University, Aborlan, Palawan.

Specifically, the study sought to

1. Determine the level of work-life balance among higher education faculty in terms of:
  - a. Personal life
  - b. Time management
  - c. Leisure
  - d. Stress
2. Determine the level of productivity among faculty involved in accreditation activities in higher education.
3. Examine the significance of the relationship between work-life balance and productivity among faculty engaged in accreditation processes.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design to examine the relationship between work-life balance and productivity among faculty members involved in accreditation at Western Philippines University. The design was appropriate because it allowed for the investigation of naturally occurring relationships between variables without manipulation. Specifically, the study sought to determine whether variations in work-life balance were associated with variations in faculty productivity during accreditation periods.

A structured survey questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data on faculty members' perceptions of their work-life balance and self-reported productivity. Descriptive statistics were utilized to determine the levels of work-life balance

and productivity, while Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was employed to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables.

## **2.2 Research Respondents and Sampling**

The study utilized purposive sampling to select participants from among faculty members actively engaged in accreditation-related activities during the most recent accreditation cycle at Western Philippines University.

The inclusion criteria required that respondents had direct involvement in accreditation tasks such as documentation preparation, curriculum review, compliance evaluation, and institutional reporting within the past academic year.

A total of 88 faculty members participated in the study. Purposive sampling ensured that only individuals with relevant accreditation experience were included, thereby strengthening the contextual validity of the findings. Participation in the study was voluntary.

## **2.3 Research Instrument**

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire divided into two major sections:

### **Section I: Work-Life Balance**

This section measured work-life balance across four dimensions:

- Personal life
- Time management
- Leisure
- Stress

Items assessed respondents' ability to maintain boundaries between work and personal life, manage time effectively, engage in leisure activities, and cope with work-related stress during accreditation periods.

### **Section II: Productivity**

This section measured faculty productivity during accreditation activities. Indicators included:

- Consistency in teaching performance
- Ability to meet deadlines
- Efficiency in managing accreditation and academic tasks
- Participation in documentation and reporting processes
- Perceived impact of additional workload on productivity

All items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

The instrument was adapted and contextualized from existing work-life balance research in higher

education settings (Javier & Rosal, 2021) to reflect accreditation-specific demands.

## **2.4 Validity and Reliability**

Content validity was established through expert evaluation by specialists in educational management and research methodology. Revisions were made based on expert feedback to improve clarity, relevance, and construct alignment.

The instrument was pilot-tested prior to full administration to ensure internal consistency and reliability. Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

## **2.5 Data Gathering Procedure**

Upon securing institutional permission, the questionnaire was distributed to eligible faculty members through both online and paper-based formats to maximize response rate. Participants were provided with an informed consent form outlining the purpose of the study, confidentiality assurances, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Data collection was conducted within a defined academic period to ensure consistency in reporting conditions.

## **2.6 Data Analysis**

Collected data were encoded and analyzed using SPSS statistical software. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were computed to determine the levels of work-life balance and productivity.

Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationship between work-life balance and productivity. Statistical significance was set at  $p < .01$ .

The correlational design allowed for the examination of associations between variables; however, causality cannot be inferred from the findings.

## **2.7 Ethical Considerations**

Ethical principles were strictly observed throughout the research process. Participants were informed of the study's objectives, procedures, potential risks, and benefits prior to participation. Written informed consent was obtained from all respondents.

Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured by excluding personally identifiable information and reporting data in aggregate form. All electronic data were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the researchers.

### 3 RESULTS AND KEY FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Work-Life Balance of Higher Education Faculty

This section presents the findings on the work-life

balance of higher education faculty, focusing on four key areas: personal life, time management, leisure, and stress. These dimensions provide a comprehensive view of how faculty members manage their responsibilities while maintaining well-being.

**Table 1. Work-Life Balance of Higher Education Faculty**

| Indicators of Work-Life Balance of Higher Education Faculty                 |                       | Mean                  | SD          | Interpretation  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| A. Personal Life  |                       | <b>3.42</b>           | <b>0.90</b> | <b>High</b>     |
| 1. I have enough time for myself outside of work.                           |                       | 3.31                  | 0.89        | Moderate        |
| 2. I can manage both my personal and work responsibilities effectively.     |                       | 3.33                  | 0.91        | Moderate        |
| 3. I maintain healthy relationships with family and friends.                |                       | 3.61                  | 0.90        | High            |
| B. Time Management  |                       | <b>3.26</b>           | <b>0.83</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |
| 4. I can finish my teaching tasks without sacrificing personal time.        |                       | 3.22                  | 0.88        | Moderate        |
| 5. I can allocate time efficiently between work and home responsibilities.  |                       | 3.34                  | 0.80        | Moderate        |
| 6. I rarely bring work home or work beyond office hours.                    |                       | 3.23                  | 0.80        | Moderate        |
| C. Leisure  |                       | <b>3.30</b>           | <b>0.90</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |
| 7. I engage in hobbies or leisure activities regularly.                     |                       | 3.16                  | 0.90        | Moderate        |
| 8. I take regular breaks or vacations to recharge.                          |                       | 3.30                  | 0.91        | Moderate        |
| 9. I can enjoy my free time without worrying about work.                    |                       | 3.43                  | 0.89        | Moderate        |
| D. Stress   |                       | <b>3.27</b>           | <b>0.90</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |
| 10. I feel overwhelmed by the demands of my job.                            |                       | 3.20                  | 0.92        | Moderate        |
| 11. I can manage stress effectively while balancing personal and work life. |                       | 3.44                  | 0.83        | High            |
| 12. My job affects my physical or emotional well-being.                     |                       | 3.18                  | 0.94        | Moderate        |
| Overall Mean  |                       | <b>3.31</b>           | <b>0.88</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |
| Scale Range   | Scale Value           | Verbal Interpretation |             |                 |
| 4.21 - 5.00   | 5 - Strongly Agree    | Very High             |             |                 |
| 3.41 - 4.20   | 4 - Agree             | High                  |             |                 |
| 2.61 - 3.40   | 3 - Neutral           | Moderate              |             |                 |
| 1.81 - 2.60   | 2 - Disagree          | Low                   |             |                 |
| 1.00 - 1.80   | 1 - Strongly Disagree | Very Low              |             |                 |

Table 1 presents the work-life balance of higher education faculty across four domains: personal life, time management, leisure, and stress. Using a 5-point Likert scale, the findings indicate an overall mean of 3.31 (SD = 0.88), interpreted as moderate. This suggests that while faculty members are generally managing their professional and personal roles, they experience noticeable constraints that may affect long-term well-being and performance.

The moderate overall rating reflects what has been described in higher education literature as a “functional strain” condition—where academics are able to meet role expectations but at the cost of reduced recovery time and increased psychological pressure (Kinman, 2016). Faculty roles have expanded significantly in recent years due to quality assurance systems, performance monitoring, and accreditation requirements, which intensify administrative workload (Guthrie et al., 2017).

The Personal Life domain yielded a high mean (M = 3.42), indicating that respondents generally maintain healthy relationships and emotional stability outside work. This suggests the presence of social support systems and effective boundary management. Research on academic well-being shows that strong interpersonal relationships

function as protective resources that buffer occupational stress and sustain professional engagement (Shin & Jung, 2021). The relatively strong personal-life rating demonstrates resilience among faculty members despite institutional demands.

In contrast, the Time Management domain received a moderate rating (M = 3.26), indicating challenges in balancing teaching responsibilities with personal time. This aligns with findings that academic staff frequently experience time-based role conflict due to overlapping teaching, research, and administrative obligations (Winefield et al., 2020). Accreditation periods, in particular, are associated with compressed deadlines and extended working hours, which may reduce faculty autonomy over time allocation. Limited control over scheduling has been consistently linked to occupational stress in higher education settings (Kinman & Johnson, 2019). Similarly, the Leisure domain was rated moderate (M = 3.30), suggesting that while faculty engage in restorative activities, such engagement may not be consistent. Recovery theory posits that leisure and psychological detachment from work are essential for replenishing cognitive and emotional resources (Sonnetag & Fritz, 2015). When faculty members

reduce leisure participation during high-demand periods, the risk of fatigue and reduced creativity increases. The relatively lower mean for regular engagement in hobbies (M = 3.16) indicates potential vulnerability in long-term recovery processes.

The Stress domain also recorded a moderate mean (M = 3.27). Faculty members moderately agreed that they feel overwhelmed by job demands, though they reported relatively strong stress management capacity (M = 3.44). This dual finding suggests that while accreditation activities introduce strain, faculty members employ adaptive coping strategies to maintain functionality. According to the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), when job demands increase, personal resources such as resilience and coping competence become critical in sustaining performance.

Notably, only two indicators reached a “High” interpretation: maintaining healthy relationships (M = 3.61) and managing stress effectively (M = 3.44). These findings highlight the importance of relational support and adaptive coping in academic contexts. Emotional resilience has been identified as a key determinant of sustained engagement among university faculty (Shin & Jung, 2021).

However, the moderate ratings across time management, leisure, and stress suggest that

accreditation-related responsibilities may constrain faculty recovery opportunities. While performance remains stable, sustained moderate strain may contribute to burnout if institutional supports are insufficient. Universities implementing accreditation systems must therefore consider not only compliance outcomes but also faculty well-being sustainability.

Overall, the findings indicate that faculty members are coping effectively but operate within a constrained equilibrium. Strengthening workload recognition, flexible scheduling, and structured wellness programs may enhance balance and reduce long-term occupational risk. In higher education environments where accountability systems continue to expand, integrating well-being policies into institutional planning is essential for sustaining both faculty performance and academic quality (Guthrie et al., 2017; Kinman & Johnson, 2019).

### 3.2 Productivity of Faculty Involved in Accreditation

This section highlights the findings on the productivity of faculty involved in accreditation. It examines their performance in teaching, research, administrative tasks, and accreditation-related contributions, providing insights into how these responsibilities influence overall faculty output.

**Table 2. Productivity of Faculty Involved in Accreditation**

| Indicators of Productivity of Faculty Involved in Accreditation                           |                       | Mean                  | SD   | Interpretation |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------|----------------|
| 1. My teaching performance remains consistent during accreditation activities.            |                       | 3.24                  | 0.82 | Moderate       |
| 2. I meet all deadlines related to teaching and accreditation tasks.                      |                       | 3.25                  | 0.91 | Moderate       |
| 3. I can manage both accreditation tasks and other academic responsibilities efficiently. |                       | 3.32                  | 0.85 | Moderate       |
| 4. I contribute actively to documentation and reporting processes for accreditation.      |                       | 3.36                  | 0.89 | Moderate       |
| 5. My productivity is affected by the additional workload during accreditation periods.   |                       | 3.32                  | 0.88 | Moderate       |
| Overall Mean  |                       | 3.30                  | 0.87 | Moderate       |
| Scale Range   | Scale Value           | Verbal Interpretation |      |                |
| 4.21 - 5.00   | 5 - Strongly Agree    | Very High             |      |                |
| 3.41 - 4.20   | 4 - Agree             | High                  |      |                |
| 2.61 - 3.40   | 3 - Neutral           | Moderate              |      |                |
| 1.81 - 2.60   | 2 - Disagree          | Low                   |      |                |
| 1.00 - 1.80   | 1 - Strongly Disagree | Very Low              |      |                |

Table 2 presents the self-assessed productivity levels of faculty members managing dual responsibilities in teaching and accreditation activities. The overall mean score of 3.30 (SD = 0.87), interpreted as moderate, indicates that while faculty are able to sustain performance during accreditation periods, their efficiency operates within constrained conditions.

Moderate productivity during periods of intensified administrative demands is consistent with research in higher education, which suggests that expanding accountability systems and

compliance requirements can redistribute faculty effort away from core academic functions (Guthrie et al., 2017). Accreditation processes often involve documentation, curriculum alignment, assessment reporting, and committee work, all of which increase cognitive workload and time pressure.

The first indicator, which measured consistency in teaching performance during accreditation (M = 3.24), suggests partial stability in instructional delivery. While teaching responsibilities are maintained, competing administrative obligations may fragment attention and reduce preparation time.

Studies on academic workload indicate that time fragmentation negatively affects instructional innovation and research productivity (Winefield et al., 2020). However, professional commitment often motivates faculty to preserve instructional standards even under strain.

Similarly, the second indicator regarding meeting deadlines ( $M = 3.25$ ) reflects moderate capacity to manage overlapping responsibilities. Time compression during accreditation cycles has been identified as a common challenge in universities implementing quality assurance frameworks (Kinman & Johnson, 2019). Faculty must navigate simultaneous reporting deadlines, student responsibilities, and institutional expectations, which may reduce flexibility in task scheduling.

The ability to manage accreditation tasks alongside other academic duties ( $M = 3.32$ ) further reflects adaptive performance rather than optimal efficiency. According to the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), sustained job demands without proportional resources may lead to strain, even if performance remains stable in the short term. Faculty may cope effectively during accreditation cycles, but repeated exposure to intensified demands could affect long-term engagement.

The highest-rated indicator ( $M = 3.36$ ) concerned active participation in documentation and reporting processes. This finding suggests a strong sense of institutional responsibility and professional accountability. Higher education research highlights that faculty engagement in governance and quality assurance activities is often driven by organizational commitment and identification with institutional goals (Shin & Jung, 2021).

At the same time, respondents acknowledged that additional workload affects productivity ( $M = 3.32$ ). This suggests awareness of performance strain during peak accreditation periods. While productivity does not significantly decline, it may be achieved through increased effort, reduced leisure, or extended working hours. Such compensatory strategies are common in academic environments characterized by performance-based accountability systems (Guthrie et al., 2017).

The uniform moderate ratings across all indicators suggest that faculty members are maintaining functional performance but are not operating at maximum efficiency. Sustained moderate productivity under pressure may lead to gradual fatigue if institutional support mechanisms are insufficient. Universities may therefore consider redistributing workload, formally recognizing

accreditation tasks in teaching loads, and providing structured time allowances during quality assurance cycles.

In summary, productivity among faculty during accreditation remains stable but constrained. Institutional recognition of dual-role demands is essential to sustain both academic quality and faculty well-being.

### **3.3 Pearson Correlation Between Work-Life Balance and Productivity of Faculty Involved in Accreditation**

This section presents the findings on the relationship between work-life balance and the productivity of faculty involved in accreditation, showing whether balancing personal and professional responsibilities has a significant impact on their performance.

**Table 3. Relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Productivity of Faculty Involved in Accreditation**

| Variables  | Correlation (r, p-value)   |
|--|----------------------------|
| Work-Life Balance vs. Productivity   | $r = 0.52, p = 0.000^{**}$ |
| Legend: r – Pearson correlation coefficient p – significance value, $^{**}p < 0.01$ = highly significant |                            |

Table 3 presents the results of the Pearson correlation analysis examining the relationship between work-life balance and productivity among faculty involved in accreditation activities. The computed correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.52, p < 0.01$ ) indicates a moderate positive and statistically significant relationship between the two variables. This finding suggests that higher levels of work-life balance are associated with higher levels of productivity during accreditation periods.

A correlation coefficient above 0.50 reflects a meaningful practical association, not merely statistical significance. The strength of this relationship implies that work-life balance functions as an important enabling factor in sustaining faculty performance under intensified institutional demands. In practical terms, faculty who effectively manage personal and professional responsibilities appear better equipped to maintain instructional consistency, meet deadlines, and contribute actively to accreditation processes.

This result is consistent with the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that personal resources such as psychological balance, recovery capacity, and boundary management buffer the impact of job demands on performance outcomes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Accreditation activities represent heightened job demands involving

documentation, compliance verification, and quality assurance reporting. When faculty members maintain work-life balance, they preserve cognitive and emotional resources necessary for sustained productivity.

Higher education research similarly indicates that reduced work-life conflict predicts greater organizational commitment, engagement, and academic effectiveness (Kinman, 2016; Shin & Jung, 2021). Faculty members experiencing lower levels of strain are more likely to sustain motivation and resilience during high-demand periods. Conversely, persistent imbalance may result in fatigue, diminished concentration, and decreased work quality (Winefield et al., 2020).

The statistically significant p-value ( $p < 0.01$ ) confirms that the observed relationship is unlikely due to chance. This reinforces the empirical importance of work-life balance as a factor influencing institutional performance outcomes. While accreditation success is often framed in procedural or compliance terms, these findings suggest that human resource factors—particularly faculty well-being—play a central role in determining effectiveness.

From a policy perspective, the results underscore the need for institutional mechanisms that promote sustainable workload structures. Flexible scheduling, formal recognition of accreditation responsibilities within teaching loads, and structured wellness initiatives may enhance both faculty well-being and productivity. Integrating well-being considerations into quality assurance planning ensures that institutional accountability does not compromise human sustainability.

In conclusion, the moderate positive relationship between work-life balance and productivity demonstrates that faculty well-being is closely linked to institutional performance during accreditation cycles. Supporting balance is therefore not merely an employee benefit but a strategic organizational investment. Universities that prioritize faculty recovery, autonomy, and workload equity may strengthen both academic quality and long-term

institutional resilience.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS

1. Moderate Work-Life Balance and Productivity Levels. Higher education faculty involved in accreditation report moderate levels of work-life balance and productivity. While they are managing to fulfill responsibilities, the pressure from accreditation duties results in reduced leisure engagement and challenges in time management, indicating the need for institutional interventions.
2. Work-Life Balance Significantly Predicts Productivity. A strong positive correlation exists between work-life balance and productivity during accreditation periods. This implies that faculty who effectively balance personal and professional demands are more likely to maintain high performance and engagement in institutional quality assurance tasks.

### 4.1 Recommendations

1. Institutionalize Supportive Time Management and Wellness Policies. Universities may adopt flexible scheduling, structured workload redistribution, and wellness programs to promote better time management and stress mitigation. These efforts can help educators manage accreditation responsibilities without sacrificing personal well-being.
2. Recognize Accreditation Duties as Part of Formal Workload. Accreditation roles may be officially recognized in faculty workload policies to reduce perceptions of “extra” responsibilities. Providing incentives, time-off, or academic credits for accreditation participation could boost morale and improve productivity.
3. Develop Capacity-Building Programs Based on Teacher Profiles. Professional development activities may be customized according to academic rank and years of service.

## REFERENCES

- Bairagi, V., & Munot, M. V. (2019). *Research methodology: A practical and scientific approach*. CRC Press.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Buley, L., & Natoli, J. (2024). *The user experience team of one: A research and design survival guide* (2nd ed.). Rosenfeld Media.
- Guthrie, J., Lichtenberg, F., & Tindall, K. (2017). Academic workload, performance measurement and burnout in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(4), 589–603.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1034264>

Javier, C., & Rosal, A. J. (2021). Work-life balance of public faculty in higher education institutions. *Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, 6(2).

<https://www.sajst.org/online/index.php/sajst/article/view/247>

Kinman, G. (2016). Effort-reward imbalance and overcommitment in UK academics: Implications for mental health, satisfaction and retention. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 38(5), 504–518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2016.1181884>

Kinman, G., & Johnson, S. (2019). Special section on wellbeing in academic employees. *Educational Psychology*, 39(3), 263–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1580981>

Oliveira, P. H. de, Almada Santos, F. C., Paschoalotto, M. A. C., Delmônico, D. V. de G., & Terence, A. C. F. (2023). Cultural dimensions as key aspects to change and improve school performance: A qualitative study in Brazilian public schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(6–7), 1197–1211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2022-0236>

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Shin, J. C., & Jung, J. (2021). Academics' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in higher education institutions: The role of work-life balance and professional autonomy. *Higher Education*, 81(5), 1031–1047. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00627-1>

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1), S72–S103. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924>

Winefield, A. H., Boyd, C., Saebel, J., & Pignata, S. (2020). Job stress in university staff: An Australian research study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(2), 277–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1666254>