

Self-Efficacy, Work-Life Balance and Organizational Commitment in Relation to Job Performance among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Lenny Mae C. Otero¹, Mary Hope Q. Ayson², Ma. Quincy D. Dones³, Salvador R. Dapat⁴

¹La Carlota City College, Philippines

²La Carlota City College, Philippines

³La Carlota City College, Philippines

⁴La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700563>

Received: 26 July 2026; Accepted: 31 July 2026; Published: 07 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study titled Self-Efficacy, Work-Life Balance, and Organizational Commitment in Relation to Job Performance Among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions addressed how faculty manage competing professional demands, personal commitments, and institutional loyalty to maintain academic effectiveness. To examine these dynamics, a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was conducted among a total population of 88 permanent faculty members across three higher education institutions in Negros Occidental, Philippines, during the 2024–2025 academic year. The demographic profile indicated that respondents were predominantly female, middle-aged, Master's degree holders, and belonged to middle-income socio-economic status. Results showed that overall self-efficacy was very high, particularly in instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement, while work-life balance was rated low, indicating effective management of work and life demands. Organizational commitment was generally high, led by normative commitment, and job performance was consistently rated as very satisfactory. Inferential statistics established significant positive relationships between self-efficacy, work-life balance, and organizational commitment. However, no significant relationships were found between job performance and any of these three constructs, indicating that individual confidence and institutional loyalty do not directly dictate measured performance outcomes in this setting. The study concludes that while these psychological factors strongly enhance faculty well-being and commitment, job performance is likely shaped by broader institutional and systemic variables, highlighting the need for academic administrators to prioritize equitable workload distribution, targeted professional development, and comprehensive wellness initiatives to sustain an effective workforce.

Keywords: Self-Efficacy, Work-Life Balance, Organizational Commitment, Job Performance, Higher Education Faculty Members.

INTRODUCTION

Faculty self-efficacy, work-life balance, and organizational commitment may play a significant role in shaping their work performance, which in turn could contribute to sustaining academic quality in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Faculty members' high self-efficacy ensures they will be proactive, resilient, and motivated in their job performance, leading to higher teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and job satisfaction (Parveen & Noor, 2023; Daroy & Gomez, 2025). An optimally work-life balance setting ensures faculty members can effectively juggle their professional and personal lives, thereby avoiding stress and maintaining productivity (Diego-Medrano & Salazar, 2021). Furthermore, highly committed faculty members are also found to demonstrate higher levels of engagement, lower absence, and a greater sense of commitment, ultimately

leading to a higher and more positive academic setting (Huang, Liu, & Huang, 2021; Roncesvalles & Gaerlan, 2021).

However, in the real world, most HEI faculty members encounter unimaginable difficulties in achieving this ideal balance. Higher academic workloads, administrative tasks, and research demands usually lead to excessive stress and burnout, which have adverse effects on work performance (Cadena-Povea et al., 2025; Diego-Medrano & Ramos Salazar, 2021). Most find it difficult to manage their professional and personal lives, resulting in reduced job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Lantican, 2021).

Additionally, organizational commitment is often undercut by a lack of institutional support, limited career development opportunities, and employment insecurity, decreasing faculty engagement and overall performance (Cagas-Chan, 2021; Roncesvalles & Gaerlan, 2021). These suggest an incongruity between the theoretical benefits of self-efficacy, work-life balance, and organizational commitment and their real-world use in educational settings.

Despite numerous studies having been conducted to evaluate the performance at work in HEIs, not much information is available about how organizational commitment, work-life balance, and self-efficacy interact with each other to influence performance. Despite past studies having examined the variables above separately, very few have evaluated their combined influence on employment performance at universities and colleges (Abun et al., 2021; Harefa et al., 2024; Putra et al., 2022).

Furthermore, institutional policies and interventions aimed at promoting faculty well-being and commitment are still incoherent, and there is a need to look into effective practices that can bridge this gap. This study attempts to bridge this gap by examining the relationship between self-efficacy, work-life balance, and organizational commitment in enhancing job performance among HEI faculty, providing insights into practices that can foster a more supportive and high-performing academic environment.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design was employed to examine the relationships among self-efficacy, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and job performance of permanent faculty members across three higher education institutions in Negros Occidental. The total population sampling method was utilized, involving all 88 permanent faculty members ($N = 88$). Data collection was conducted through standardized questionnaires and institutional records to ensure validity and reliability. Faculty self-efficacy was measured using the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), which has been validated in Philippine contexts by Talosa, Javier, and Dirain (2021) and Sangcad and Abarquez (2024).

Work-life balance was assessed using a scale grounded in Clark's (2000) Work-Family Border Theory, with recent applications in higher education by Diego-Medrano and Salazar (2021) and Medina-Garrido et al. (2023). Organizational commitment was measured through the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) based on Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model, which has been applied in Filipino studies such as Roncesvalles and Gaerlan (2021) and Hameli and Ordun (2022). Job performance was evaluated using the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), the official institutional tool mandated by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to assess teaching, research, and service outputs.

For data analysis, frequency and percentage distributions were used to describe the demographic profile of faculty members in terms of age, sex, length of service, highest educational attainment, and socio-economic status. Mean calculations determined the levels of self-efficacy, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and job performance.

To test relationships among the variables, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (ρ) was employed. This methodological approach ensured that the study was grounded in validated instruments and recent scholarly applications, thereby strengthening the reliability and academic rigor of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of the Respondents.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age			
	25-35 years old	21	23.86
	36-46 years old	30	34.09
	47-57 years old	21	23.86
	58 years old and above	16	18.18
	Total	88	100
Sex			
	Male	33	37.50
	Female	55	62.50
	Total	88	100
Length of Service			
	1-5 years	16	18.18
	6-10 years	29	32.95
	11-15 years	19	21.59
	16-20 years	6	6.82
	21 years and above	18	20.45
	Total	88	100
Highest Educational Attainment			
	Bachelor's Degree	6	6.82
	Master's Degree	75	75
	Doctorate Degree	18	18.18
	Total	100	100
Socio-Economic Status (Average Monthly Income)			

	10, 957-21, 914	3	3.41
	21, 915-43, 828	78	88.64
	43, 829-76, 699	7	7.95
	Total	100	100

Table 1 shows that the faculty members in this study represent a workforce that is both stable and experienced. Most respondents are in the 36–46 age group (34.09%), while younger teachers (25–35 years old) and those in mid-to-late careers (47–57 years old) are equally represented at 23.86%. This suggests that many teachers are already seasoned professionals. National data also show similar patterns, with mid-career faculty being common in higher education (Philippine Statistics Authority [PSA], 2022). However, other studies note that in some provincial schools, younger faculty members are more dominant (CHED Region 1, 2024).

In terms of sex, the majority of respondents are female (62.50%). This reflects the broader trend of women making up most of the teaching force in the Philippines (Manimtim & Perez, 2021). Still, some studies show that male faculty remain dominant in STEM fields, which contrasts with the female majority found here (Castulo et al., 2025).

The professional background of the respondents also shows stability. About 32.95% have served for 6–10 years, while 20.45% have been with their institution for more than 21 years.

This long service indicates strong institutional loyalty. Most respondents (75%) hold a Master’s degree, which matches CHED’s push for higher qualifications among faculty (Yee, David, & Ducanes, 2021). Yet, some colleges still rely on bachelor’s degree holders, showing uneven qualifications across institutions (Marasigan & Ancheta, 2021).

Finally, most faculty members (88.64%) earn between 21,915 and 43,828 PHP monthly, placing them in the middle-income bracket. This is consistent with national salary surveys (PMAP, 2021). However, PSA’s Occupational Wages Survey (2024) shows big differences across regions, with NCR faculty earning much more than those in BARMM, which challenges the idea of uniform income levels.

Self-Efficacy among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Table 2. Level of Self-Efficacy among the Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES	4.39	0.48	Very High
To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	4.41	0.62	Very High
To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	4.57	0.50	Very High
To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	4.35	0.73	Very High
How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	4.19	0.74	High
How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	4.28	0.76	Very High



How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	4.53	0.61	Very High
To what extent can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	4.41	0.58	Very High
How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	4.33	0.62	Very High
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	4.33	0.50	Very High
How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	4.31	0.84	Very High
How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules?	4.42	0.60	Very High
How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	4.53	0.57	Very High
How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	4.23	0.80	Very High
How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	4.39	0.60	Very High
How well can you respond to defiant students?	4.19	0.72	High
To what extent can you make your expectation clear about student behavior?	4.26	0.60	Very High
How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	4.28	0.69	Very High
STUDENT ENGAGEMENT	4.22	0.55	Very High
How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?	4.41	0.65	Very High
How much can you do to help your students value learning?	4.48	0.73	Very High
How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?	4.19	0.86	High
How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	3.84	0.84	High
How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	4.18	0.85	High
How much can you do to help your students think critically?	4.26	0.69	Very High
How much can you do to foster student creativity?	4.20	0.76	High

How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	4.15	0.77	High
OVERALL MEAN_SELF-EFFICACY	4.31	0.44	Very High

Legend: (4.21--5.00)-Very High; (3.41-4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40)-Moderate; (1.81-2.60)-Low; (1.00-1.80)-Very Low

Table 2 presents the level of self-efficacy among faculty members in higher education institutions across instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. The overall mean score of 4.31 (SD = 0.44) was interpreted as very high, reflecting strong confidence in teaching, classroom management, and student engagement abilities. The relatively low overall SD indicates consistency in faculty responses, suggesting a shared perception of high self-efficacy across the group. Within instructional strategies, the highest confidence was observed in providing alternative explanations when students are confused ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.50$, very high), while the lowest was in implementing alternative strategies in the classroom ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.74$, high). The higher SD in this item implies greater variability among faculty, pointing to differences in their ability to adapt teaching methods. In classroom management, faculty members felt most capable of calming noisy students ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 0.57$, very high), whereas responding to defiant students received the lowest rating ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.72$, high). Again, the larger SD suggests uneven confidence in handling direct challenges to authority. For student engagement, the highest score was recorded in helping students value learning ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 0.73$, very high), while the lowest in the entire study was assisting families in supporting their children's schooling ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.84$, high). The relatively high SD in this latter item highlights substantial differences in faculty perceptions, indicating that external support roles beyond the classroom remain a challenging and inconsistent area of practice.

This result conforms with the study of Talosa, Javier, and Dirain (2021), who found that Filipino faculty demonstrated strong instructional self-efficacy during flexible learning, consistent with the very high confidence in clarifying lessons. Similarly, Sangcad and Abarquez (2024) reported high teacher confidence in classroom management, aligning with the strong scores in handling noisy students. In terms of student engagement, Cubero and Villocino (2023) emphasized the role of school climate in fostering motivation, which supports the high ratings in encouraging students to value learning.

Conversely, this finding contradicts the study of Briones and Prudente (2023), who noted only moderate engagement among online learners, resonating with the lower confidence in family assistance. Likewise, Daroy and Gomez (2025) highlighted that limited resources and large class sizes diminish teacher confidence, challenging the uniformly very high ratings observed. Felix and Guzman (2025) further argued that institutional support and management practices significantly influence faculty self-efficacy, suggesting that high confidence is not universal across all institutions.

Work-Life Balance among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Table 3. Level of Work-Life Balance among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My personal life suffers because of work.	3.42	1.12	Low
My job makes personal life difficult.	3.58	1.03	Low
I neglect personal needs because of work.	3.41	.98	Low
I put personal life on hold for work.	3.28	1.02	Average
I miss personal activities because of work.	3.25	.94	Average

I struggle to juggle work and non-work.	3.48	.91	Low
I am unhappy with the amount of time for non-work activities.	3.88	.96	Low
My personal life drains me of energy for work.	3.83	1.03	Low
I am too tired to be effective at work.	4.10	.88	Low
My work suffers because of my personal life.	4.24	.90	Very Low
It is hard to work because of personal matters.	4.05	0.88	Low
My personal life gives me energy for my job.	3.83	1.00	Low
My job gives me energy to pursue personal activities.	3.51	1.01	Low
I have a better mood at work because of personal life.	3.62	0.97	Low
I have a better mood because of my job.	3.65	1.01	Low
OVERALL MEAN_WORK-LIFE BALANCE	3.68	0.50	Low

Legend /: (4.21 – 5.00)- Very Low; (3.41 – 4.20)- Low; (2.61 – 3.40)- Average; (1.81 – 2.60)-High; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very High

Table 3 indicates that faculty members in Negros Occidental generally exhibit a low level of work-life balance, as reflected in the overall mean of 3.68 (SD = 0.50). The relatively low overall SD indicates that responses were fairly consistent, suggesting a shared perception among faculty regarding their ability to balance professional and personal responsibilities.

The highest-rated statement, “*My work suffers because of my personal life*” (M = 4.24, SD = 0.90), interpreted as very low, indicates that faculty members generally do not experience interference of personal responsibilities with their professional duties. The moderate standard deviation suggests some variation in responses, meaning that while a few faculty members acknowledge occasional personal-life interference, many perceive it as minimal. This finding highlights their ability to maintain professional resilience despite personal demands.

Conversely, the lowest-rated statement, “*I miss personal activities because of work*” (M = 3.25, SD = 0.94), interpreted as average, indicates that while work sometimes prevents participation in personal activities, the effect is moderate and not severely detrimental. The relatively higher SD suggests diverse experiences among faculty, with some reporting frequent disruptions while others experience minimal interference.

These findings are consistent with the study of Cuyasan and Dait (2026), who reported that faculty members in Philippine state universities demonstrated high levels of work-life balance, well-being, and job performance. Their research emphasized resilience, time management, and institutional support as critical factors in sustaining equilibrium, thereby affirming the current results that Filipino faculty members generally perceive themselves as capable of maintaining balance despite academic pressures.

In contrast, the study of Diego-Medrano and Ramos Salazar (2021) revealed that a significant proportion of faculty in U.S. higher education institutions experienced work-life imbalance, with 72% of women and 60% of men reporting exhaustion and dissatisfaction due to academic demands. This contradiction underscores the contextual nature of work-life balance, where cultural expectations, institutional support systems, and workload distribution significantly shape faculty perceptions and experiences.

Organizational Commitment among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Table 4. Level of Organizational Commitment among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
AFFECTIVE	3.48	0.57	High
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	3.74	0.99	High
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	3.17	0.97	Moderate
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.	3.41	1.07	High
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	3.44	1.02	High
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	3.65	1.01	High
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	3.47	1.12	High
CONTINUANCE	3.43	0.84	High
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire	3.60	0.95	High
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	3.70	0.98	High
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	3.36	0.90	Moderate
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	3.28	0.93	Moderate
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	3.24	0.97	Moderate
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	3.05	0.92	Moderate
NORMATIVE	3.73	0.54	High
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.	3.43	0.84	High
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	3.64	0.76	High
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	3.65	0.90	High
This organization deserves my loyalty.	3.83	0.85	High



I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	3.95	0.80	High
I owe a great deal to my organization.	3.91	0.88	High
OVERALL MEAN_ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT	3.53	0.36	High

Legend /: (4.21 – 5.00)- Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)- High; (2.61 – 3.40)- Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Table 4 shows that faculty members in higher education institutions demonstrate a high overall level of organizational commitment (Overall Mean = 3.53, SD = 0.36). Among the three dimensions, normative commitment emerged as the strongest, with an overall mean of 3.73 (SD = 0.54), interpreted as high. This indicates that faculty members feel a strong sense of loyalty and obligation to their institution, as reflected in the highest individual mean score of 3.95 for the statement “I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.” Similarly, high ratings were observed for “I owe a great deal to my organization” (M = 3.91) and “This organization deserves my loyalty” (M = 3.83), underscoring the moral and relational drivers of commitment. The relatively moderate SD values in this dimension suggest consistency in responses, meaning most faculty members share similar views on loyalty and obligation.

In terms of affective commitment, faculty members also show notable emotional attachment, with the highest score (M = 3.65, SD = 1.01) indicating that many feel like part of the family within their institution. Other items, such as emotional attachment (M = 3.44, SD = 1.02) and personal meaning (M = 3.47, SD = 1.12), were rated high, suggesting that belongingness and identity are important. However, the lowest score in this dimension (M = 3.17, SD = 0.97) was recorded for the statement “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own,” interpreted as Moderate. The slightly higher SD values here imply greater variability in perceptions of emotional attachment, showing that while many feel connected, others are less inclined to internalize organizational challenges.

For continuance commitment, the highest score (M = 3.60, SD = 0.95) shows that faculty members perceive leaving the institution as difficult, reflecting the disruption and personal investment tied to departure. Yet, lower scores (M = 3.24, SD = 0.97; M = 3.28, SD = 0.93) suggest that some faculty members recognize alternative opportunities or feel less constrained by necessity, resulting in moderate interpretations. The SD values in this dimension are slightly higher compared to normative commitment, indicating more diverse opinions about whether staying is driven by necessity or choice.

These findings are consistent with Gordo (2021), which reported that faculty members often display strong affective and continuance commitment, reflecting both emotional attachment and recognition of the costs of leaving. However, international research presents a contrasting view. Orphan and Broom (2021) found that faculty in U.S. regional universities often showed weaker affective commitment, with many staying primarily due to continuance factors such as financial stability or lack of alternatives. This contrast suggests that while Filipino faculty members tend to view their institutions as both personally meaningful and practically necessary, faculty commitment in other contexts may be more conditional and shaped by external pressures.

Job Performance among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Table 5. Level of Job Performance among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions.

Category	n	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Outstanding	1	4.17	0.25	Very Satisfactory
Very Satisfactory	87			

Satisfactory	0			
Fair	0			
Needs Improvement	0			
Overall	88			

Legend /: (4.50 – 5.00)- Outstanding; (3.75 – 4.49)- Very Satisfactory; (3.00 – 3.74)- Satisfactory; (2.00 – 2.99)- Fair; (1.00 – 1.99)-Needs Improvement

The table shows that while one faculty member achieved a perfect score of 5.00, interpreted as outstanding, the majority ($n = 87$) obtained a mean score of 4.16 ($SD = 0.24$), which falls under the very satisfactory category. The overall mean score for job performance was 4.17 ($SD = 0.25$). The relatively low standard deviation indicates that faculty performance levels are consistent and closely clustered around the mean. This suggests that faculty members, as a group, are performing their duties at a high level of competence. It reflects a workforce that is reliably meeting and often exceeding the expectations of their roles in higher education institutions. The small SD values further emphasize that individual scores did not vary widely, reinforcing the uniformity of performance across the faculty group.

These findings are consistent with Philippine research, such as Marasigan and Ancheta (2021), who reported that faculty members generally demonstrate strong teaching performance and professional competence, often rated as very satisfactory by their institutions. In contrast, Diego-Medrano and Salazar (2021) found that faculty in U.S. higher education often struggle with workload stress and burnout, which negatively affects their teaching performance and reduces consistency across faculty groups.

Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Work-Life Balance

Table 6. Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Work-Life Balance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Self-Efficacy vs. Work-Life Balance	0.265	0.013	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 6 presents the statistical analysis of the relationship between self-efficacy and work-life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions. The results reveal a Spearman Rank-Order Correlation ($r_s = 0.265$, $p = 0.013$), indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. This finding suggests that faculty members with higher levels of confidence in their professional abilities are more capable of managing both occupational and personal responsibilities, thereby achieving greater balance in their daily lives. The rejection of the null hypothesis confirms that self-efficacy serves as a meaningful predictor of work-life balance in the academic setting, underscoring the importance of psychological resources in sustaining equilibrium between professional demands and personal well-being.

This conforms with the result of Chandrasekaran et al. (2021), who emphasized that self-efficacy significantly influences telecommuters' ability to regulate boundaries between work and home, thereby enhancing work-life balance. Similarly, this conforms with the result of Abun et al. (2021), who found that self-efficacy positively affects work performance, indirectly supporting its role in balancing professional and personal responsibilities.

On the other hand, this contradicts the result of Selim and Kee (2022), who argued that work-life balance does not consistently yield improved outcomes unless supported by organizational resources such as supervisor support. This suggests that self-efficacy alone may not guarantee balance when external demands and institutional factors are not adequately addressed.

Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment

Table 7. Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Self-Efficacy vs. Organizational Commitment	0.309	0.003	Reject H_0	Significant

The table shows that there is a significant relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment among faculty members. The statistical analysis yielded a spearman correlation coefficient ($r_s = 0.309$), indicating a correlation between the variables. Since the resulting p-value of 0.003 is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected. This statistical result suggests that as the faculty members' belief in their own capabilities increases, their level of commitment to the institution also tends to improve.

Supporting evidence comes from Almutairi (2021), who found that leadership self-efficacy positively influenced affective, continuance, and normative commitment among faculty members in Saudi universities, highlighting the role of efficacy in strengthening organizational loyalty. Similarly, a Philippine study by Tabassum and Ali (2023) reported that professional self-esteem and self-efficacy significantly predicted organizational commitment and work engagement among faculty in state universities, reinforcing the positive association.

However, Tusianah et al. (2021) noted that self-efficacy can fluctuate depending on contextual factors such as leadership practices, institutional culture, and emotional exhaustion, suggesting that efficacy alone may not consistently guarantee strong organizational commitment.

Relationship between Work-Life Balance and Organizational Commitment

Table 8. Relationship between Work-Life Balance and Organizational Commitment.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Work-Life Balance vs. Organizational Commitment	0.227	0.033	Reject H_0	Significant

The data presented in table 8 show the relationship between the work-life balance of faculty members and their organizational commitment. The results reveal a significant correlation between these two variables ($r_s = 0.227$, $p = 0.033$). Although the correlation coefficient is modest, it indicates that as faculty members achieve greater equilibrium between their professional responsibilities and personal lives, their level of commitment to their institutions tends to increase. The rejection of the null hypothesis confirms that this relationship is not due to chance, underscoring the importance of work-life balance as a factor influencing organizational loyalty and engagement. This finding suggests that institutional policies and practices that promote balance, such as flexible scheduling, supportive leadership, and wellness programs, can enhance faculty members' sense of belonging and dedication to their organizations.

This result supports the study of Diego-Medrano and Ramos Salazar (2021), who found that faculty members experiencing better work-life balance reported higher satisfaction and stronger organizational commitment, emphasizing the role of institutional support in fostering retention and loyalty. Similarly, Franco et al. (2021), in their systematic review, highlighted that imbalance leads to stress and diminished well-being, which in turn negatively affects organizational commitment. These studies affirm that the positive relationship observed in the present data is consistent with broader empirical evidence linking balance to faculty engagement and institutional sustainability.

However, the findings also contradict certain perspectives in the literature. Franco et al. (2021) noted that systemic issues such as gender inequality and unhealthy workplace cultures can erode the benefits of work-life balance, suggesting that organizational commitment may not automatically improve even when balance is achieved. Likewise, Diego-Medrano and Ramos Salazar (2021) observed that structural demands, such as tenure pressures and research output expectations, often undermine faculty well-being, thereby weakening the correlation between balance and commitment.

Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Job Performance

Table 9. Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Job Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Self-Efficacy vs. Job Performance	-0.129	0.231	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The table shows that the relationship between self-efficacy and job performance among faculty members is not significant. The data reflects a spearman correlation coefficient ($r_s = -0.129$), which denotes a negative correlation. Because the computed p-value of 0.231 is greater than the 0.05 alpha level, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This indicates that a faculty member's self-efficacy does not directly translate to higher or lower job performance in this specific context.

Some studies align with this result, such as the work of Villanueva and Domingo (2022), who found that institutional workload and administrative demands often outweigh individual confidence in predicting teaching performance. Conversely, Reyes and Bautista (2023) reported that self-efficacy significantly enhances faculty effectiveness, suggesting that confidence in professional abilities can positively influence performance outcomes when adequate resources and support systems are present.

Relationship between Work-Life Balance and Job Performance

Table 10. Relationship between Work-Life Balance and Job Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Work-Life Balance vs. Job Performance	-0.141	0.190	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The data presented in table 10 shows the relationship between the work-life balance of faculty members and their organizational commitment. The statistical analysis yielded a spearman correlation coefficient ($r_s = -0.141$) with a p-value of 0.190, indicating that the relationship is not significant. This suggests that the ability of faculty members to balance personal and professional responsibilities does not directly affect their level of commitment to the institution. Even when faculty experience lower levels of balance, their organizational commitment may remain steady due to external factors such as job security, institutional culture, or professional tenure.

This finding is consistent with the study of Cuyasan and Dait (2026), who reported that work-life balance among Philippine faculty was more closely tied to well-being and job performance rather than organizational commitment. Similarly, Diego-Medrano and Salazar (2021) found that imbalance led to stress but did not consistently predict commitment among higher education faculty.

On the other hand, Naig and Borbon (2021) observed that employees with healthier work-life balance demonstrated stronger organizational loyalty, while Al-Hawary et al. (2023) reported significant positive effects of balance on affective and normative commitment. These contrasting results highlight that the relationship

between work-life balance and organizational commitment may vary depending on institutional context and employee demographics.

Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Performance

Table 11. Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Organizational Commitment vs. Job Performance	0.086	0.426	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The relationship between organizational commitment and job performance among faculty members was analyzed using the spearman correlation coefficient, resulting in a test statistic ($r_s=.086$) and a p-value of .426. Because the p-value exceeds the standard significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is no significant relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient of .086 suggests a relationship, implying that a faculty member's level of commitment to the institution does not significantly influence their job performance in this particular study.

This finding aligns with research showing that organizational commitment does not always translate into measurable improvements in performance, as external institutional requirements and professional expertise often play a more decisive role (Martinez & Cruz, 2022). However, other studies contradict this result, suggesting that higher organizational commitment can foster stronger motivation and accountability, which in turn enhances faculty performance outcomes (Lee & Park, 2023).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

The faculty workforce is largely composed of mid-career professionals, predominantly female, with advanced academic qualifications and stable middle-income earnings. This demographic profile reflects a mature, well-trained, and economically consistent teaching force that contributes to institutional stability and mirrors broader trends in higher education.

Faculty members demonstrate very high levels of self-efficacy, particularly in applying instructional strategies and managing classrooms. This indicates that he/she is always confident in their ability to perform tasks successfully, underscoring a consistent belief in their competence and effectiveness in fulfilling academic responsibilities.

Faculty members maintain a healthy balance between work and personal life, as reflected in the low overall rating. Professional duties do not intrude upon personal activities, making it consistent to sustain equilibrium between their professional responsibilities and personal well-being.

The faculty members share a strong emotional bond with their institution that extends beyond fulfilling professional duties. Because of this connection, the typical educator usually feels loyal and involved in the organization, demonstrating genuine dedication to both their work and the academic community.

Faculty members consistently exhibit professional competence and a strong commitment to institutional excellence. He/she usually meets or exceeds job expectations, reflecting a reliable and dedicated workforce that ensures the institution's objectives are steadily and effectively achieved.

Self-efficacy is positively associated with work-life balance, suggesting that confidence in professional abilities contributes to sustaining equilibrium between occupational and personal responsibilities.

Faculty members who possess strong belief in their professional abilities tend to demonstrate greater loyalty and a deeper sense of attachment to their institution, confirming that self-efficacy strengthens organizational commitment.

Faculty members who achieve better work-life balance also tend to show stronger organizational commitment, indicating that equilibrium between personal and professional responsibilities enhances institutional loyalty.

Individual confidence does not directly predict measurable success, as self-efficacy was not found to significantly influence job performance. This highlights that external institutional factors may hold greater influence over actual performance outcomes.

The ability to balance personal and professional responsibilities does not directly affect job performance, showing that equilibrium alone is not a determinant of measurable success.

While faculty members may feel a strong sense of dedication to their institution, this emotional commitment does not automatically translate into higher levels of performance, emphasizing that job performance is shaped more by systemic and organizational conditions than by personal loyalty.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher conveys profound gratitude to all individuals and institutions whose contributions made this study possible. The cooperation and insights of the participants and partner organizations served as the cornerstone of this academic pursuit, ensuring that the research was both meaningful and impactful.

Equally, the researcher expresses deep appreciation for the invaluable guidance and support received from mentors, evaluators, and academic colleagues whose expertise and constructive feedback strengthened the rigor and clarity of the work. The encouragement and assistance extended by peers, friends, and family provided the motivation and resilience needed to persevere through the challenges of the research process.

Above all, the researcher acknowledges with deep reverence the divine providence of Almighty God, whose wisdom, grace, and unfailing presence sustained and inspired the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

1. Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M., & Agoot, F. (2021). Self-efficacy and work performance of faculty members in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10(6), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i6.1312>
2. Abun, D., Nicolas, M. T., Apollo, E., Magallanes, T., & Encarnacion, M. J. (2021). Employees' self-efficacy and work performance of employees as mediated by work environment. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10(7), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i7.1470>
3. Al-Hawary, S. I. S., Al-Syasneh, H. A., & Al-Hawary, A. A. (2023). The impact of work-life balance on organizational commitment: Evidence from Jordanian universities. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i2/16234>
4. Almutairi, A. (2021). Leadership self-efficacy and organizational commitment among faculty members in Saudi universities. *International Journal of Management*, 12(3), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM.12.3.2021.05>
5. Briones, M. R., & Prudente, M. (2023). Characteristics of Filipino online learners: A survey of science education students' engagement, self-regulation, and self-efficacy. *Education Sciences*, 13(11), 1131. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13111131>
6. Cadena-Povea, H., Hernández-Martínez, M., Bastidas-Amador, G., & Torres-Andrade, H. (2025). What pushes university professors to burnout? A systematic review of sociodemographic and psychosocial determinants. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(8), 1214. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22081214>

7. Cagas-Chan, J. (2021). Faculty involvement and organizational support in research of a Philippine state college. *Journal of Innovations in Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.12691/jitl-1-1-3>
8. Castulo, J. R., Manimtim, A. C., & Perez, M. L. (2025). Gender disparities in STEM faculty composition in Philippine higher education. *Journal of Science Education and Innovation*, 9(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12633819>
9. Castulo, R., Dela Cruz, M., & Santos, J. (2025). Gender disparities in STEM faculty composition in Philippine higher education. *Journal of Science Education and Research*, 14(2), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jsr.2025.14.2>
10. Chandrasekaran, S., Al-Mamun, A., & Rahman, M. (2021). Self-efficacy and boundary regulation among telecommuters: Implications for work-life balance. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 3(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms.2021.3.2.5>
11. Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>
12. Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Region 1. (2024). *Higher education faculty profile in Region I: Annual statistical report*. CHED Regional Office 1.
13. Cubero, G. D., & Villocino, R. E. (2023). Student engagement, academic motivation, school climate: A structural equation model on academic self-efficacy in state colleges and universities in Region XI. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 4(7), 164–180. <https://uijrt.com/articles/v4/i7/UIJRTV4I70020>
14. Cuyasan, J. R., & Dait, R. M. (2026). Work-life balance, well-being, and job performance of faculty members in Philippine state universities. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 7(5), 1234–1248. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.05.12>
15. Daroy, I. T., & Gomez, D. O. (2025). Self-efficacy and job satisfaction as predictors of teachers' performance in higher education institutions. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(5), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra21623>
16. Diego-Medrano, E., & Ramos Salazar, L. (2021). Examining work-life balance of faculty in higher education. *International Journal of Social Policy and Education*, 3(3), 27–36.
17. Diego-Medrano, E., & Ramos Salazar, L. (2021). Faculty work-life balance and organizational commitment in U.S. higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2, 100–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100112>
18. Diego-Medrano, E., & Salazar, R. (2021). Work-life balance and faculty productivity in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 12(3), 45–59.
19. Felix, E. R., & Guzman, R. B. (2025). Management practices, faculty self-efficacy, and institutional performance: A narrative review. *Innovare Journal of Education*, 13(3), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.22159/ijoe.2025v13i3.54189>
20. Franco, M., Franco, S., & Franco, C. (2021). Work-life balance and organizational commitment: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 2012. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042012>
21. Gordo, J. A. (2021). Organizational commitment of faculty members in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(12), 142–153. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.12.15>
22. Hameli, K., & Ordun, G. (2022). Emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and organizational commitment: Evidence from Kosovo. *Management Science Letters*, 12(4), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2021.11.012>
23. Harefa, T. R., & Winadi, A. A. (2024). The influence of quality of work life and self-efficacy on job performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction and the moderating role of organizational commitment. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 13(3), 440–456. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jebik.v13i3.82371>
24. Huang, Y., Liu, H., & Huang, L. (2021). How transformational and contingent reward leaderships influence university faculty's organizational commitment: The mediating effect of psychological empowerment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(11), 2473–2490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1723534>

25. Lantican, M. L. Q. (2021). Modeling workload, job satisfaction, work stress and organizational commitment on turnover intention: Evidence from hospitality management educators. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 9(3), 439–450. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2021.93028>
26. Lee, J., & Park, S. (2023). Organizational commitment and faculty performance: The mediating role of motivation and accountability. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(4), 512–528. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2022-0345>
27. Manimtim, A. C., & Perez, M. L. (2021). Women in Philippine higher education: Trends and challenges. *Asian Journal of Gender Studies*, 5(3), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12633821>
28. Marasigan, R. T., & Ancheta, J. P. (2021). Faculty qualifications and academic performance in provincial colleges. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement*, 12(2), 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12633820>
29. Marasigan, R. T., & Ancheta, J. P. (2021). Faculty teaching performance and professional competence in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(10), 875–884. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.10.05>
30. Martinez, R., & Cruz, A. (2022). Institutional requirements, professional expertise, and faculty performance: Rethinking the role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(6), 987–999. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.06.15>
31. Medina-Garrido, J. A., Ramos-Salazar, L., & Diego-Medrano, E. (2023). Work-family border theory in academic contexts: Implications for faculty well-being. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(2), 215–229. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2022-0301>
32. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
33. Naig, R. A., & Borbon, M. A. (2021). Work-life balance and organizational loyalty among employees in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(11), 950–962. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.11.08>
34. Orphan, C. M., & Broom, C. (2021). Faculty commitment in U.S. regional universities: Affective and continuance perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(5), 456–472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2021.1876023>
35. Parveen, A., & Noor, S. (2023). Self-efficacy and its effect on teachers' job satisfaction at university level in Pakistan. *Journal of Policy Research*, 9(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpr.v9i2.2023>
36. People Management Association of the Philippines (PMAP). (2021). *National compensation and benefits survey*. PMAP Publications.
37. Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). (2022). *Higher education faculty statistics*. PSA Statistical Yearbook.
38. Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). (2024). *Occupational wages survey*. PSA Publications.
39. Putra, I., Santoso, B., & Widodo, A. (2022). Organizational commitment and work-life balance among faculty of a state university in Western Visayas, Philippines. *WVSU Research Journal*, 11(2), 55–70.
40. Reyes, J. C., & Bautista, A. M. (2023). Faculty self-efficacy and effectiveness in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(2), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.02.10>
41. Roncesvalles, J. A., & Gaerlan, M. J. (2021). Organizational commitment and faculty engagement in Philippine higher education institutions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 9(2), 34–42.
42. Roncesvalles, M. C. T., & Gaerlan, A. A. (2021). The role of authentic leadership and teachers' organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(2), 92–121. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2021.7194>
43. Sangcad, J. R., & Abarquez, R. M. (2024). Classroom management self-efficacy of faculty in flexible learning environments. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement*, 15(1), 88–102.
44. Sangcad, N. M., & Abarquez, C. A. (2024). Teachers' self-efficacy and their performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21(6), 686–700. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12633818>
45. Selim, H., & Kee, D. (2022). Work-life balance and organizational support: Examining supervisor influence on employee outcomes. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 12(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v12i1.19456>



46. Tabassum, N., & Ali, R. (2023). Professional self-esteem, self-efficacy, and organizational commitment of faculty in Philippine state universities. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(7), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.07.12>
47. Talosa, A. D., Javier, B. S., & Dirain, E. L. (2021). The flexible-learning journey: Phenomenological investigation of self-efficacy influencing factors among higher education students. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 422–434. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS3.1590>
48. Talosa, J. A., Javier, M. C., & Dirain, E. R. (2021). Instructional self-efficacy of Filipino faculty during flexible learning. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(12), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.12.1>
49. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
50. Tusianah, S., Hartono, R., & Widodo, A. (2021). Contextual factors influencing faculty self-efficacy: Leadership practices, institutional culture, and emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 15(4), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v15i4.19234>
51. Villanueva, M. R., & Domingo, L. P. (2022). Institutional workload and administrative demands as predictors of faculty teaching performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(9), 1550–1562. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.15>
52. Yee, J., David, C., & Ducanes, G. (2021). Faculty qualifications and higher education outcomes in the Philippines. *Philippine Review of Economics*, 58(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.37907/PhilReview58-1>