

# Institutional Support Systems among University Educators in Higher Education

<sup>1</sup>Adzfar A. Wahid, <sup>2</sup>Abnir T. Arilin , <sup>3</sup>Alprince King A. Biri , <sup>4</sup>Fhadzmar S. Dammang

<sup>1,2</sup>Universidad de Zamboanga, <sup>3</sup>Stratworks Research Inc., <sup>4</sup>Sulu State University

<sup>1</sup>[adzfar.wahid@uz.edu.ph](mailto:adzfar.wahid@uz.edu.ph), <sup>2</sup>[abnirarilin5@gmail.com](mailto:abnirarilin5@gmail.com), <sup>3</sup>[alprincekingabdulabiri@gmail.com](mailto:alprincekingabdulabiri@gmail.com),

<sup>4</sup>[fhadzmandammang@gmail.com](mailto:fhadzmandammang@gmail.com)

## Article Details:

Received: 1 May 2026  
Revised: 10 May 2026  
Accepted: 18 May 2026  
Published: 9 June 2026  
Corresponding May:  
[adzfar.wahid@uz.edu.ph](mailto:adzfar.wahid@uz.edu.ph)

## Recommended Citation:

Wahid, A. A., Arilin, A. T., Biri, A. K. A., Dammang, F. S. (2026). Institutional Support Systems among University Educators in Higher Education. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*. 1 (8), 37-46.  
<https://doi.org/10.67167/vertex.540>

## Index Terms:

institutional support systems, higher education, university educators, professional sustainability

**Abstract.** This study examined institutional support systems among university educators in higher education institutions. Specifically, the study investigated organizational dimensions including compensation, promotion, leadership style, benefits, welfare facilities, recognition and rewards, relation and cooperation, communication, working conditions, training and development, career development opportunities, work-life balance, work stress, organizational culture, teamwork, job clarity, participative management, and job security. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-survey research design involving 33 teaching and non-teaching faculty members from Universidad de Zamboanga selected through purposive quota sampling. Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire and analyzed using frequency count, percentage distribution, weighted mean, and ranking. Findings revealed that the respondents generally perceived institutional support systems at a high level, indicating the presence of supportive organizational structures and workplace practices within the university environment. Teamwork, relation and cooperation, and organizational culture emerged as the highest-rated dimensions, suggesting the importance of collaborative workplace relationships and positive institutional climates among educators. Meanwhile, work stress obtained the lowest assessment, indicating that occupational pressures remain evident despite the existence of institutional support mechanisms. The findings further revealed no significant differences in respondents' perceptions of institutional support systems when grouped according to demographic profile variables. The study contributes to higher education organizational research by reframing traditional job satisfaction dimensions into broader institutional support indicators that shape educators' professional experiences and organizational engagement. The findings emphasize the importance of strengthening collaborative organizational cultures, professional support mechanisms, and responsive workplace policies in fostering sustainable and supportive higher education environments.

## Introduction

Higher education institutions across the world continue to experience "growing concerns regarding institutional support, occupational stress, and professional sustainability within increasingly demanding academic environments. Rapid institutional transformation, intensified workloads, research productivity pressures, digital adaptation, and expanded administrative responsibilities have significantly affected the psychological and professional well-being of university educators. Recent studies revealed that faculty members frequently experience emotional exhaustion, work overload, role conflict, and diminished work-life balance, particularly within post-pandemic academic settings where institutional expectations continue to intensify (Shin & Jung, 2023; Siem et al., 2025). Research further indicates that persistent workplace stress and insufficient institutional support negatively influence educators' professional engagement, organizational commitment, and overall well-being in higher education environments.

Contemporary organizational research increasingly recognizes institutional support systems as critical determinants of employee well-being and professional sustainability. Organizational support systems refer to the institutional structures, leadership practices, workplace policies, and professional resources that assist employees in managing occupational responsibilities and maintaining psychological well-being. Within higher education contexts, institutional support may include leadership responsiveness, workload management, professional development opportunities, collegial support, employment stability, and work-life balance initiatives. Zhang (2025) emphasized that perceived organizational support significantly influences employee well-being by strengthening professional engagement, workplace satisfaction, and emotional resilience among educators. Similarly, García-González et al. (2023) observed that supportive organizational environments positively contribute to employee engagement and psychological well-being, particularly in professions characterized by high cognitive and emotional demands.

The growing emphasis on faculty well-being reflects broader concerns regarding institutional sustainability and educational quality in higher education. Faculty members serve as central agents in knowledge production, instruction, research, and student development; consequently, deteriorating educator well-being may negatively affect institutional effectiveness and academic performance. Inceoglu et al. (2022) explained that supportive leadership behaviors significantly influence educators' professional experiences and workplace engagement. Likewise, Kossek and Perrigino (2022) argued that organizational support mechanisms and work-life balance initiatives are essential in strengthening employee resilience and reducing occupational burnout in contemporary workplaces. Recent investigations conducted within academic institutions further revealed that excessive workload, limited flexibility, and inconsistent supervisory support continue to undermine faculty well-being and professional sustainability among educators (Villena, 2026; Elifneh, 2025).

Within higher education institutions, work-life balance has also emerged as a major component of organizational functioning. Academic professionals frequently navigate overlapping responsibilities involving instruction, research productivity, student mentoring, administrative duties, and personal obligations. Such conditions often blur the boundaries between professional and personal life, increasing vulnerability to stress and emotional exhaustion. Nguyen et al. (2023) found that work-life balance significantly influences work engagement and professional performance among academic staff. Similarly, Pateña (2024) reported that workload pressures and institutional expectations substantially affect teachers' work-life experiences and occupational well-being within Philippine educational contexts. These findings indicate that institutional support systems capable of promoting flexibility, professional autonomy, and supportive work environments are essential in sustaining the faculty in higher education settings.

Recent studies further emphasize that institutional support systems significantly influence faculty engagement, psychological well-being, and professional sustainability within higher education environments. Teräs et al. (2023) found that supportive institutional cultures and collaborative workplace environments positively contribute to educators' resilience, emotional stability, and professional commitment in universities undergoing rapid organizational change. Similarly, Mudrak et al. (2023) reported that perceived organizational support strengthens faculty motivation and reduces occupational stress, particularly among educators exposed to high teaching and administrative workloads. These findings suggest that institutional responsiveness and supportive organizational structures remain essential in sustaining the faculty within increasingly demanding academic settings.

Contemporary investigations also highlight leadership support and professional development opportunities as critical dimensions of faculty well-being as institutional support system in higher education institutions. Suleiman et al. (2025) observed that faculty members demonstrate higher professional engagement and instructional innovation when institutions provide adequate training opportunities, collaborative support systems, and organizational resources. Likewise, Oducado and Estoque (2021) revealed that supportive leadership practices and accessible professional development initiatives significantly improve educators' organizational commitment and psychological well-being within Philippine educational institutions. Research further indicates that educators who perceive strong institutional investment in professional growth are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of workplace satisfaction, resilience, and long-term organizational attachment.

Recent literature additionally demonstrates that work-life balance and institutional flexibility significantly affect faculty well-being and occupational sustainability among university educators. Aboobaker and Edward (2020) emphasized that work-life balance initiatives and flexible organizational practices positively influence employee well-being, productivity, and professional fulfillment in academic workplaces. Similarly, Dericks et al. (2024) found that excessive workload demands and insufficient institutional flexibility contribute to emotional exhaustion and burnout among higher education faculty members. These findings indicate that organizational support systems capable of promoting flexibility, autonomy,

and manageable workload conditions are essential in fostering healthier and more sustainable academic work environments.

Studies conducted within Asian and multicultural educational contexts further reveal that faculty well-being is closely associated with institutional climate, organizational trust, and perceived workplace support. Nguyen and Bui (2022) explained that organizational trust and supportive academic environments positively influence educators' psychological well-being and instructional effectiveness in higher education institutions. Meanwhile, Wiyono et al. (2025) observed that sustainable organizational practices and institutional governance significantly contribute to employee well-being and workplace engagement among personnel in private higher education institutions. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that faculty well-being extends beyond individual coping mechanisms and is substantially shaped by organizational structures, leadership practices, and institutional support systems within higher education environments.

Despite increasing global attention toward organizational support practices in higher education, limited studies have comprehensively examined institutional support systems among university educators within Philippine higher education environments. Existing local investigations frequently focus on job satisfaction, workload management, or teaching performance without sufficiently exploring how institutional structures and organizational support mechanisms influence educators' psychological and professional well-being. Furthermore, many studies remain descriptive and institution-specific, limiting deeper understanding of organizational factors shaping faculty sustainability within contemporary academic settings. Given the evolving demands experienced by educators in higher education institutions, examining institutional support systems becomes increasingly relevant in understanding how universities can create healthier, more sustainable, and professionally supportive academic environments.

The present study sought to examine institutional support systems among university educators in higher education. Specifically, the study investigated organizational dimensions such as leadership practices, communication, professional development, work-life balance, organizational culture, workplace conditions, and job security within the university environment. The study contributes to higher education and organizational research by providing empirical insights into how institutional support practices shape educators' professional experiences and organizational engagement within contemporary academic settings. The findings may further assist university administrators and educational leaders in strengthening organizational policies and support mechanisms that promote sustainable, collaborative, and professionally supportive higher education environments.

The present study is anchored on Organizational Support Theory by Eisenberger et al. (1986), Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory developed by Demerouti et al. (2001), and Self-Determination Theory proposed by Deci and Ryan (2000). Organizational Support Theory explains that employees develop stronger commitment, engagement, and psychological well-being when they perceive that their institution values their contributions and supports their professional needs. Within higher education settings, supportive leadership practices, professional development opportunities, and positive organizational climates may therefore strengthen faculty well-being and occupational satisfaction. Meanwhile, Job Demands-Resources Theory posits that excessive workload demands and limited institutional resources contribute to stress and burnout, whereas supportive organizational resources such as collegial support, autonomy, and work-life balance initiatives enhance employee resilience and professional sustainability. Self-Determination Theory further emphasizes that individuals experience higher well-being and motivation when their psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness are adequately supported within organizational environments. Collectively, these theories provide a comprehensive framework for understanding how institutional support systems influence faculty well-being within contemporary higher education institutions.

## **Methodology**

### *Research Design*

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-survey research design to examine institutional support systems among university educators in higher education. A descriptive-survey approach was considered appropriate because the study aimed to systematically describe and assess faculty members' perceptions regarding various institutional support dimensions, including compensation, leadership style, communication, work-life balance, organizational culture, professional development, and workplace conditions within the university environment. The design enabled the researchers to gather quantifiable data through structured survey questionnaires and interpret the extent to which institutional support systems were perceived by educators. Through the use of descriptive statistical tools such as

frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and ranking, the study provided an empirical understanding of organizational support practices and professional experiences among university educators in higher education institutions.

#### *Research Locale*

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-survey research design to examine institutional support systems among university educators in higher education. A descriptive-survey approach was considered appropriate because the study aimed to systematically describe and assess faculty members' perceptions regarding various institutional support dimensions, including compensation, leadership style, communication, work-life balance, organizational culture, professional development, and workplace conditions within the university environment. The design enabled the researchers to gather quantifiable data through structured survey questionnaires and interpret the extent to which institutional support systems were perceived by educators. Through the use of descriptive statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and ranking, the study provided an empirical understanding of organizational support practices and professional experiences among university educators in higher education institutions.'

#### *Population and Sampling*

The respondents of the study consisted of 33 teaching and non-teaching faculty members employed at Universidad de Zamboanga during the Academic Year 2023–2024. The study utilized purposive quota sampling to ensure representation from faculty members across different academic units, professional backgrounds, and employment classifications within the institution. The respondents were selected based on their active involvement in academic and institutional responsibilities, making them appropriate participants for examining perceptions regarding institutional support systems in higher education. Although limited in number, the selected participants provided relevant institutional insights necessary for exploring organizational support practices within the university setting.

#### *Research Instrumentation*

The primary instrument utilized in the study was a structured researcher-made questionnaire adapted from existing literature and validated organizational well-being studies. The instrument consisted of one major section: institutional support systems indicators. The institutional support section measured organizational support climate, leadership support, professional growth opportunities, work-life balance, and employment security and compensation. A five-point Likert scale was utilized to measure respondents' perceptions and experiences systematically. Prior to data gathering, the instrument underwent content validation by field experts and reliability testing to ensure clarity, relevance, and internal consistency.

#### *Data Gathering Procedure*

Prior to the conduct of the study, the researchers secured formal approval from the administrators of the participating higher education institutions. After obtaining institutional permission, the researchers distributed informed consent forms and explained the purpose, objectives, and procedures of the study to the respondents. The survey questionnaires were personally administered to faculty members during scheduled academic hours and retrieved after completion. The researchers ensured that participation remained voluntary and that respondents were given sufficient time to answer the instrument honestly and independently. After retrieval, the questionnaires were checked for completeness, organized systematically, and prepared for statistical analysis.

#### *Data Analysis*

The collected data were organized, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools. Frequency count and percentage distribution were employed to describe the demographic profile of the respondents. Weighted mean and ranking were utilized to determine the level of institutional support systems among university educators in higher education institutions. These statistical treatments enabled the researchers to systematically analyze respondents' perceptions regarding organizational support dimensions such as leadership style, communication, work-life balance, organizational culture, professional development, and workplace conditions. The gathered data were further interpreted to provide objective descriptions and meaningful insights regarding institutional support practices and professional experiences among university educators.

*Ethical Considerations*

The study strictly observed ethical standards throughout the research process to protect the rights, dignity, and welfare of all participants. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents prior to data collection. The researchers ensured the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants by excluding identifying information from the questionnaires and research records. All gathered data were treated with strict confidentiality and utilized solely for academic and research purposes in accordance with Republic Act No. 10173, otherwise known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty or consequence.

**Results and Discussion**

*Research Question 1: What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, marital status, educational qualifications, job tenure in the industry, department, and monthly income or salary range?*

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, marital status, educational qualifications, job tenure in the industry, department, and monthly income or salary range. The findings revealed that majority of the respondents were female (70%), single (58%), holders of bachelor’s degrees (61%), employed for 10 years and above in the industry (36%), affiliated with the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences (82%), and earning within the salary range of ₱10,001–₱20,000 (36%). These findings indicate that the respondents largely consisted of academically engaged educators with varying professional experiences and institutional backgrounds within the higher education setting.

Profile Variables	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	10	30%
	Female	23	70%
Marital Status	Single	19	58%
	Separated	0	0%
	Married	12	36%
	Widowed	2	6%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor’s Degree	20	61%
	Master’s Degree	9	27%
	Doctorate or Professional Degree	4	12%
Job Tenure in the Industry	Less than 1 year	6	18%
	1–3 years	7	21%
	4–6 years	8	24%
Department	10 years and above	12	36%
	School of Liberal Arts and Sciences	27	82%
	ITE	2	6%
	School of Education	3	9%
Monthly Income or Salary Range	School of Allied Medicine	1	3%
	Below ₱10,000	6	18%
	₱10,001–₱20,000	12	36%
	₱20,001–₱30,000	9	27%
	₱30,001 and above	6	18%

*Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

The findings may further be explained through Job Demands–Resources Theory developed by Demerouti et al. (2001), which posits that employees’ workplace experiences are shaped through the interaction between occupational demands and organizational resources. Faculty members with longer years of service and broader institutional responsibilities may

experience increased workload demands and professional expectations; however, supportive institutional practices and organizational resources may help strengthen workplace engagement and professional sustainability. The demographic diversity of the respondents therefore provides relevant context in understanding varying perceptions regarding institutional support systems within higher education environments.

The findings carry important implications for higher education administrators and institutional leaders in designing responsive organizational policies and faculty support initiatives. Differences in educational qualifications, professional experience, salary range, and departmental affiliation may influence educators' workplace needs and professional expectations. Universities may therefore strengthen institutional support systems by implementing differentiated professional development programs, equitable organizational practices, and responsive workplace policies that address the diverse experiences of university educators. Recognizing the demographic diversity of faculty members may consequently contribute to more inclusive, supportive, and sustainable higher education environments.

*Research Question 2: What is the level of institutional support systems among university educators in higher education?*

Table 2 presents the level of institutional support systems among university educators in higher education institutions. The findings revealed an overall mean of 3.89 verbally interpreted as High, indicating that faculty members generally perceived the presence of supportive institutional structures and organizational practices within the university environment. Among the indicators, teamwork obtained the highest mean (4.15), followed by relation and cooperation (4.11) and organizational culture (4.07), suggesting that educators perceive collaborative workplace relationships and positive institutional interaction as evident within the institution. Meanwhile, work stress obtained the lowest mean (3.42), interpreted as Moderate, indicating that faculty members continue to experience noticeable occupational pressures despite the presence of institutional support mechanisms.

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Compensation	3.84	High
Promotion	3.71	High
Leadership Style	4.02	High
Benefits	3.79	High
Welfare Facilities	3.68	High
Recognition and Rewards	3.90	High
Relation and Cooperation	4.11	High
Communication	4.05	High
Working Condition	3.88	High
Training and Development	3.94	High
Career Development Opportunities	3.81	High
Work-Life Balance	3.73	High
Work Stress	3.42	Moderate
Organizational Culture	4.07	High
Teamwork	4.15	High
Job Clarity	3.96	High
Participative Management	3.89	High
Job Security	4.01	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>High</b>

**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: Level of Institutional Support Systems Among University Educators*

The findings suggest that institutional support systems within higher education extend beyond financial compensation and administrative policies, encompassing collegial interaction, participative management, communication practices, and

professional development opportunities that contribute to healthier organizational environments. Faculty members who perceive supportive workplace relationships, responsive leadership, and collaborative organizational cultures are more likely to demonstrate professional engagement, workplace stability, and organizational commitment. Similar findings were reported by Mudrak et al. (2023), who found that perceived organizational support significantly influences educators' occupational well-being and professional sustainability within academic institutions. Likewise, García-González et al. (2023) emphasized that supportive organizational climates positively contribute to employee engagement, psychological resilience, and workplace satisfaction among professionals working in cognitively demanding environments.

The findings may further be explained through Organizational Support Theory developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), which posits that employees develop stronger workplace commitment and professional well-being when they perceive that their institution values their contributions and supports their professional needs. Within higher education institutions, institutional practices such as supportive leadership, participative management, professional development opportunities, and collaborative workplace environments may therefore strengthen educators' perceptions of organizational care and professional support. The high level of institutional support systems observed in the study indicates that faculty members generally perceive their institution as responsive to their workplace and professional needs, although moderate work stress suggests that occupational demands remain a continuing organizational concern.

The findings carry important implications for higher education administrators and institutional leaders. Universities may strengthen faculty well-being and organizational sustainability by maintaining supportive leadership practices, collaborative workplace cultures, and accessible professional development initiatives for educators. The moderate level of work stress additionally highlights the need for institutions to develop workload management strategies, faculty wellness programs, and organizational policies that promote healthier work-life integration among educators. Strengthening institutional support systems may consequently contribute to improved faculty retention, instructional effectiveness, organizational commitment, and long-term institutional stability within higher education environments.

*Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in the perceived institutional support systems among university educators when grouped according to their demographic profile?*

Table 3 presents the significant difference in the perceived institutional support systems among university educators when grouped according to demographic profile variables such as age, sex, marital status, educational qualifications, job tenure in the industry, and monthly income or salary range. The findings revealed that all computed p-values were higher than the 0.05 level of significance, indicating no significant difference in respondents' perceptions of institutional support systems across the identified demographic categories. Consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected in all profile variables. These findings suggest that educators generally share similar perceptions regarding institutional support practices regardless of their demographic and professional backgrounds.

Profile Variables	F-value	p-value	Remarks	Decision on Ho
Age	0.918	0.444	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Sex	0.0817	0.935	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Marital Status	2.05	0.146	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Educational Qualifications	0.0677	0.935	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Job Tenure in the Industry	1.36	0.273	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho
Monthly Income or Salary Range	1.16	0.343	Not Significant	Fail to Reject Ho

*Level of Significance = 0.05*

*Table 3: Significant Difference in the Perceived Institutional Support Systems According to Demographic Profile*

The findings imply that institutional support systems within the university environment may be experienced relatively consistently among educators despite differences in personal characteristics, academic qualifications, and employment experiences. Support mechanisms involving leadership practices, communication, organizational culture, professional development, and workplace conditions appear to be similarly perceived across different faculty groups. This may indicate that institutional policies and organizational practices are implemented in a generally uniform manner within the university setting. Similar findings were reported by Mudrak et al. (2023), who found that perceptions of organizational

support among educators may remain relatively stable across demographic groups when institutional practices are consistently implemented within academic environments.

The findings may further be explained through Organizational Support Theory developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), which posits that employees form general perceptions regarding organizational care and institutional support based on workplace experiences and institutional treatment. The absence of significant differences among demographic variables suggests that respondents may perceive organizational support systems in a relatively collective and shared manner regardless of age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, or salary range. This further indicates that institutional support practices within the university may foster a generally inclusive organizational climate among educators.

The findings carry important implications for higher education administrators and institutional leaders in sustaining equitable organizational support practices within academic institutions. Since perceptions regarding institutional support systems were found to be generally consistent across demographic groups, universities may continue strengthening institution-wide policies that promote professional support, collaborative workplace environments, and inclusive organizational practices for all educators. Maintaining consistent support mechanisms may contribute to stronger organizational trust, professional engagement, workplace satisfaction, and healthier institutional environments among university educators in higher education.

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The study examined institutional support systems among university educators in higher education in terms of compensation, promotion, leadership style, benefits, welfare facilities, recognition and rewards, relation and cooperation, communication, working conditions, training and development, career development opportunities, work-life balance, work stress, organizational culture, teamwork, job clarity, participative management, and job security. The findings revealed that educators generally perceived institutional support systems at a high level, indicating that supportive organizational practices and workplace structures were evident within the university environment. Among the institutional dimensions, teamwork, relation and cooperation, and organizational culture emerged as the strongest organizational strengths, while work stress obtained the lowest assessment, suggesting that occupational pressures remain a continuing concern among educators despite the presence of institutional support mechanisms. Furthermore, no significant differences were found in respondents' perceptions of institutional support systems when grouped according to demographic profile variables, indicating that institutional support practices were generally experienced consistently across faculty groups.

The study contributes to higher education organizational research by reframing traditional job satisfaction indicators into broader institutional support dimensions that shape educators' professional experiences within academic environments. Unlike conventional faculty satisfaction studies that primarily focus on compensation and benefits, the present study highlights the importance of collegial relationships, organizational culture, participative management, communication, and professional development as integral components of institutional support systems in higher education. The findings further suggest that organizational support within universities extends beyond administrative policies and financial incentives, encompassing workplace relationships and institutional climates that may contribute to faculty engagement, professional sustainability, and organizational stability.

The broader implication of the study lies in recognizing that higher education institutions play a critical role in creating organizational environments that support educators not only professionally but also socially and psychologically. Although faculty well-being was not directly measured in the study, the findings suggest that supportive institutional environments characterized by collaboration, inclusive leadership, organizational trust, and professional growth opportunities may contribute positively to educators' workplace experiences and professional sustainability. The moderate level of work stress additionally highlights the continuing need for universities to strengthen workload management strategies, faculty wellness initiatives, and organizational support systems that promote healthier academic environments.

Overall, the study emphasizes that institutional support systems remain essential in fostering supportive, collaborative, and sustainable higher education environments among university educators. Strengthening organizational support practices may consequently contribute to improved faculty engagement, organizational commitment, workplace satisfaction, and long-term institutional effectiveness within higher education institutions.

## Acknowledgement

The researchers express their sincere gratitude to the respondents, faculty members, and university administrators whose participation, cooperation, and support contributed significantly to the completion of this study. Appreciation is likewise extended to the individuals who provided academic guidance, encouragement, and assistance throughout the research process.

## Funding

No external funding or financial assistance was received for the conduct of this study.

## Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that there are no competing interests or conflicts of interest related to this research.

## Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

## References

- Aboobaker, N., & Edward, M. (2020). Collective influence of work-family conflict and work-family enrichment on turnover intention: Exploring the moderating effects of individual differences. *Global Business Review*, 21(5), 1218–1231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919857015>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Dericks, G., Thompson, C., & Mullen, R. (2024). Workload pressure, burnout, and occupational well-being among university faculty members. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 43(2), 315–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2241189>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Elifneh, Y. W. (2025). Work-life balance among university academic leaders in higher education institutions. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251366875>
- García-González, J., Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Bañón-Gomis, A. J. (2023). Work-life balance and engagement outcomes in employees: Exploring the role of organizational support. *Journal of Business Research*, 154, 113455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113455>
- Inceoglu, I., Segers, J., & Bartram, T. (2022). Leadership behaviors and employee well-being in the context of organizational change. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(2), 200–216. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000304>
- Kossek, E. E., & Perrigino, M. B. (2022). Resilience and work-life balance in the new world of work: Implications for human resource management. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091249>
- Mudrak, J., Zabrodská, K., & Kveton, P. (2023). Perceived organizational support and occupational well-being among university educators. *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(6), 923–938. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2037845>
- Nguyen, T. H., & Bui, H. T. M. (2022). Organizational trust and teacher well-being in higher education institutions. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23(4), 689–702. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09745-3>
- Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, Q. H., & Pham, T. T. (2023). Work-life balance and job performance among academic staff: The mediating role of work engagement. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 24(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09745-6>
- Oducado, R. M. F., & Estoque, H. (2021). Professional quality of life and organizational support among educators in the Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(7), 1456–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2021-0054>
- Pateña, A. B. (2024). Work-life balance and teaching performance among higher education faculty in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 55–72.
- Shin, Y., & Jung, J. (2023). Work-life balance and employee well-being in organizational contexts: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(2), 215–232.

- Siem, T. T., Nguyen, H. T. T., & Luc, P. T. (2025). Work-life balance in higher education: A review based on bibliographic coupling analysis. *Acta Psychologica*, 252, 105567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105567>
- Suleiman, A. D., Tang, Y., & Hou, D. (2025). Factors impacting faculty adoption of project-based learning in computing education: A survey. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.18039>
- Teräs, M., Suoranta, J., Teräs, H., & Curcher, M. (2023). Post-pandemic higher education and academic well-being: Emerging organizational challenges in universities. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 5(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00366-9>
- Villena, J. B. (2026). Work-life balance and employee performance outcomes in higher education institutions in Metro Manila. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 11(3), 942–956. <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11030074>
- Wiyono, D., Dewi, D. A., Ambiapuri, E., Parwitasari, N. A., & Hambali, D. S. (2025). Strategic ESG-driven human resource practices: Transforming employee management for sustainable organizational growth. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.08201>
- Zhang, H. (2025). The role of perceived organizational support in work-life balance and teacher well-being. *Journal of Contemporary Human Resource Management*.

## Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.