

Educational Environment and Quality Work-Life Balance as Predictors of Teacher Well-Being: A Diagnostic Study Design

Dorries Jeanne P. Buenaflor

lourchan10082015@gmail.com

Tapaz Integrated School, Tapaz Sta. Josefa, Agusan del Sur, Philippines

Abstract

Poor teacher well-being is a global concern. The significance of the contribution of educational environment and quality work-life balance as causes of teacher well-being was determined. Using diagnostic research design and surveying 100 teachers selected through random sampling, the multiple linear regression analysis revealed that quality work-life balance strongly influences teacher well-being, while the educational environment does not show a significant relationship, partially supporting the Two-Factor Theory of Motivation. Future research may examine additional factors and use qualitative approaches to better understand teacher well-being, while school leaders are encouraged to strengthen programs that promote a healthy work-life balance.

Keywords: Educational environment, quality work-life balance, predictors of teacher well-being, diagnostic study design

Introduction

Poor teacher well-being has become a significant concern in the global education sector. Recent studies report that many teachers experience low levels of psychological and professional well-being across different educational systems. Evidence from international educational reports indicates that teacher well-being remains a persistent issue affecting educators worldwide and continues to be documented in contemporary research (OECD, 2023; Hascher & Waber, 2023).

In the United States, studies show that teachers experience reduced levels of well-being within the profession (Pressley, 2023). In China, research indicates that many teachers report low professional well-being in school settings (Chen et al., 2023). Similarly, studies conducted in the United Kingdom also document concerns regarding teacher well-being in the teaching profession (Allen et al., 2023).

In the Philippine context, poor teacher well-being has also been documented among educators. These findings indicate that teacher well-being remains an important issue among teachers in the Philippines (Balbuena & Balbuena, 2023; Dela Cruz & Abad, 2024).

Consequently, declining well-being among teachers has been linked to increased intentions to leave the profession and challenges in sustaining a stable teaching workforce. These consequences highlight the importance of addressing teacher well-being as a critical concern in maintaining the effectiveness and sustainability of education systems worldwide (Beames et al., 2023; Kurrle & Warwas, 2025). This urgency prompted the conduct of this study.

Methodology

The diagnostic research design was used in this study. It was used to identify, analyze, and explain a specific problem by examining its characteristics and the relationships among variables within a particular context. It focuses on when researchers aim to examine existing issues in a specific population or setting without manipulating the variables. This design helps provide a clear description of the problem and supports informed decision-making. Its advantages include enabling researchers to clearly identify and analyze problems, providing systematic information about relationships among variables, and offering empirical evidence that can guide strategies, interventions, and policy development (Kumar, 2023; Saunders et al., 2023; Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

The study was conducted in the Sta. Josefa District, under the supervision of the Department of Education through the Schools Division of Agusan del Sur. The district was in the municipality of Sta. Josefa in the Caraga Region comprised several public elementary schools that provided basic education to learners from various barangays in the locality. As part of the public education system, the district implements the national basic education curriculum and supports various instructional programs and professional development activities for teachers. The schools in the district serve as important educational institutions that promote the academic and holistic development of pupils while supporting the goals and standards of basic education in the region.

The study involved 100 elementary school teachers from selected public elementary schools. These teachers were selected regardless of their sex or the number of years of teaching. They were officially employed as regular for the school year 2024-2025.

Stratified random sampling was employed to ensure that teachers from different schools were proportionately represented in the sample. In this technique, the population was divided into subgroups or strata, and respondents were randomly selected from each group to ensure fair representation. The researcher secured the official list of teachers from the school heads and randomly selected the respondents. Using simple random sampling procedures, the 100 samples were considered sufficient for the statistical analysis of the collected data in addressing the research questions and problems of the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2023; Kumar, 2023).

This study utilized a survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering method, which collects self-reported information from respondents regarding their experiences, perceptions, and attitudes through a standardized set of questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The study used three adapted instruments: the Educational Environment questionnaire with 15 items developed by Algaidi (2010); the Quality Work-Life Balance scale with 43 items developed by Swamy, Nanjundeswaraswamy and Rashmi (2015); and the Teacher Well-being Scale with 30 items adapted from Springer and Hauser (2003), which measures respondents perceived level of well-being.

There were three data analysis techniques employed in this study, namely, descriptive, correlation, and regression analyses.

Descriptive analysis was a statistical technique used to summarize and present the main characteristics of data using measures such as mean and standard deviation to describe the level of variables, while correlation analysis is a statistical technique used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between variables using Pearson-r moment correlation (Creswell, 2023; Kumar, 2023). Lastly, regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables, helping

identify significant predictors and estimate the strength and direction of their influence based on the unstandardized and standardized beta coefficient (Hair et al., 2023; Montgomery et al., 2023).

To describe the level of variables, the following scale and descriptions was used:

Scale	Description Level	Educational Environment	Quality Work-life	Teacher Well-being
3.27-4.00	Very High	Very Good	Very Good	Very strong
2.52-3.26	High	Good	Good	Strong
1.76-2.51	Poor	Poor	Poor	Weak
1.00-1.75	Very Poor	Very Poor	Very poor	Very weak

To describe the strength of the correlation of the variables, the following standard was the basis:

Computed <i>r</i>	Descriptive Interpretation
+/- 1.00	Perfect Correlation
Between +/- 0.75 – +/- 0.99	High correlation
Between +/- 0.51 – +/- 0.74	Moderately high correlation
Between +/- 0.31 – +/- 0.50	Moderately low correlation
Between +/- 0.01 – +/- 0.30	Low Correlation
0.00	No Correlation

The following was the Standard Deviation Value Interpretation:

Range	Description	Interpretation
SD ≤ 0.50	Highly Consistent Responses	Strong and uniform perception
SD = 0.51 – 1.00	Moderately Consistent Responses	Acceptable consistency
SD = 1.01 – 1.50	Low Consistency Responses	Differing views or experiences
SD > 1.5	Very Low Consistency Responses	High variability and lack of consensus

In terms of Scale of Beta (β) Coefficient Strength, the following scheme, as proposed by Cohen (1988) and Hair et al. (2019), was used:

β Value Range	Strength of Influence
$\pm 0.00 - \pm 0.09$	Very Weak
$\pm 0.10 - \pm 0.29$	Weak
$\pm 0.30 - \pm 0.49$	Moderate
$\pm 0.50 - \pm 0.69$	Strong
± 0.70 and above	Very Strong

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to key ethical principles, including institutional approval, informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity, and data protection. Before data collection, approval was obtained from the Holy Cross of Davao College – Society for Moral Integrity and Legal Ethics (SMILE), the Department of Education Division Research Committee, and the school heads of the participating schools. All respondents were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study and were assured that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained by excluding identifying information from the report, and the collected data were used solely for academic purposes.

RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Table 1 is the descriptive table. It contains the variables, namely, educational environment, teacher's well-being, and quality of work-life balance, with their respective indicators. It also includes the sample size, computed means, standard deviations, and the corresponding descriptive interpretations.

Table 1. Descriptive Table (n=100)

Variables	N	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Educational Environment	100	0.27	1.73	Very Low
Perception of Role Autonomy	100	0.34	1.64	Very Low
Perception of Teaching	100	0.33	1.67	Very Low
Perception of Social Support	100	0.27	1.86	Low
Quality of Work-Life Balance	100	0.22	3.11	High
Work Environment	100	0.27	3.12	High
Organizational Culture and Climate	100	0.32	2.97	High
Relation and Cooperation	100	0.27	3.12	High
Training and Development	100	0.31	3.21	High
Compensation and Rewards	100	0.30	3.08	High
Facilities	100	0.34	3.06	High
Job Satisfaction and Job Security	100	0.30	3.21	High
Autonomy of work	100	0.33	3.13	High
Adequacy of resources	100	0.26	3.05	High
Teacher Well-being	100	0.37	3.24	Very High
Autonomy	100	0.25	3.07	High
Environmental mastery	100	0.26	3.14	High

Personal Growth	100	0.31	3.34	Very High
Positive Relations	100	0.38	3.30	Very High
Purpose of Life	100	0.39	3.43	Very High
Self-acceptance	100	0.30	3.20	High

3.27-4.00= Very High; 2.52-3.26= High; 1.76-2.51= Low; 1.00-1.75= Very Low;

Specifically, the table reveals that the educational environment obtained a mean described as very low ($M = 1.73$), which suggests that the educational environment of the respondents is very poor. The standard deviation obtained ($SD = 0.27$) is described as a highly consistent response, indicating strong and uniform perceptions. Likewise, quality work-life balance obtained a mean described as high ($M = 3.11$), which suggests that the quality work-life balance of the respondents is good. The standard deviation obtained ($SD = 0.22$) is described as a highly consistent response, indicating strong and uniform perceptions. Lastly, teacher well-being obtained a mean described as very high ($M = 3.24$), which suggests that the teacher well-being of the respondents is very good. The standard deviation obtained ($SD = 0.27$) is described as a highly consistent response, indicating strong and uniform perceptions.

The findings indicate that the educational environment is perceived as very poor, while quality work-life balance is perceived as good. In contrast, teacher well-being is perceived to be very strong, showing a more positive condition compared to the educational environment.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Table 2 shows the correlation results. It included the determinants, r-value, p-value, decision on null hypotheses, and their corresponding interpretations.

Table 2. Correlation Table

Determinants	Teacher Well-Being			
	r	p-value	Decision on H_0	Interpretation
Educational Environment	0.019	0.855	Not Rejected	Not Significant
Quality of Work-Life Balance	.540	<.001	Rejected	Significant

Level of Significance: 0.05 Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if $p < 0.05$

Specifically, Table 2 shows that the correlation between educational environment and quality of work-life balance obtained a p-value of 0.855, which is more than 0.05 degrees of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It indicates that the correlation between these two variables is not significant. With an r-value of 0.019, it is indicated that the correlation is low. Moreover, the correlation between quality of work-life balance and teacher well-being yielded a p-value of 0.001, which is less than a 0.05 degree of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that the correlation between these two variables is significant. With an r-value of 0.540, it is indicated that the correlation is moderately high.

The findings indicate that the educational environment has no significant relationship with quality work-life

balance. In contrast, quality work-life balance shows a significant and stronger relationship with teacher well-being.

REGRESSION RESULTS

Table 3 presents a regression table. It contained the predictors, the criterion variable, unstandardized and standardized beta coefficients, standard error, t-value, significance, decision on null hypothesis, and interpretation.

Table 3. Regression Table

Predictors	Teacher Well-Being						Interpretation
	Unstandardized		Standardized Coefficients			Decision on Ho	
	Coefficients		Beta	T	Sig.		
	B	Std. Error					
Constant	3.198	0.030	-	105.138	< .001	-	-
Educational Environment	-0.230	0.102	-0.201	-2.252	0.027	Rejected	Negative significant influence
Quality of Work-Life Balance	0.829	0.121	0.612	6.853	< .001	Rejected	Positive significant influence

$R = .616$, $R^2 = .380$, $F(2, 97) = 29.733$, $p\text{-value} = <.000$

Level of Significance: 0.05

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if $p < 0.05$

Specifically, Table 3 shows that the quality work-life balance determinant obtained a standard beta coefficient of 0.829. With the corresponding p-value obtained that is 0.000, the null hypothesis was rejected. It denotes that the influence of quality work-life balance on teacher well-being is positively significant. This implies that for every unit increase in teachers' well-being, there is a corresponding 0.829 unit increase in teacher well-being. Collectively, the determinants obtained an R^2 value of .380. Its corresponding p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05 degrees of confidence, indicates that the moderate combined influence of the determinants on the criterion is significant. In short, the results show that quality work-life balance has a significant positive influence on teacher well-being.

DISCUSSIONS

Quality of Work-Life Balance and Teacher Well-being Correlation

The present study found that quality work-life balance correlates with teacher well-being, highlighting that teacher well-being is more directly influenced by their ability to balance work and personal life. This finding supports Collie (2021), who stated that when teachers can effectively manage their professional and personal responsibilities, they experience higher levels of psychological well-being and are less likely to suffer from emotional exhaustion. Moreover, the current finding also reinforces Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2021), mentioning that teachers who maintain clear boundaries between work and personal life demonstrate better mental health outcomes, reinforcing that work-life balance is a stronger determinant of teacher well-being than environmental conditions alone.

However, this current finding negates the finding of Pagán-Castaño et al. (2021), who claimed that the educational environment significantly influences teachers' work-life balance, found that supportive leadership and positive school conditions directly improved their ability to manage professional and personal responsibilities, thereby enhancing their well-being. The claim of Pagán-Castaño et al. is based on a study involving 80 samples. Whereas the current finding is a result obtained from 100 samples.

Teacher Well-Being as Predicted by Educational Environment and Quality Work-Life Balance

The findings of the study indicate that both the educational environment and quality work-life balance have a significant influence on teacher well-being, suggesting that supportive workplace conditions combined with effective personal balance significantly improve teachers' overall mental health and job satisfaction. This result supports McCallum et al. (2021), asserting that the combined effects of a supportive educational environment and strong work-life balance significantly predict higher teacher well-being, as both organizational support and personal balance together reduce stress and enhance job satisfaction. Moreover, the current finding reinforces Collie (2021), who mentioned that teachers working in positive school environments who also maintain a healthy work-life balance report significantly better overall well-being, indicating that both contextual and personal factors jointly contribute to improved mental health and professional fulfillment.

However, the current finding negates Ansley (2021) claiming that the combined influence of educational environment and work-life balance was not statistically significant. The claim of Ansley is based on a study involving 72 samples. Whereas the current finding was a result obtained from 100 samples.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it is concluded that quality work-life balance has a very strong and significant influence (0.829) on teacher well-being; the educational environment showed no significant correlation with the criterion. This conclusion partly affirmed the Two-Factor Theory of Motivation positing that employee motivation and job satisfaction are shaped by two distinct categories of factors: hygiene factors and motivator factors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusion, future research is recommended to explore additional variables not included in the present study to account for the remaining 62% variance in teacher well-being. Conducting qualitative studies is also encouraged to generate emerging themes that may be utilized as potential factors that may influence teacher well-being. Furthermore, school leaders may implement and strengthen programs that enhance healthy work-life balance and reallocate resources to this purpose towards the promotion of teacher well-being.

REFERENCES

- Acton, R., & Glasgow, P. (2015). Teacher well-being in neoliberal contexts: A review of the literature. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(8), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015v40n8.6>.
- Algaidei, S. A. (2010). Assessment of educational environment for interns using the postgraduate hospital educational environment measure (PHEEM). *Medical Teacher*.
- Allen, R., Jerrim, J., & Sims, S. (2023). How did the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic affect teacher wellbeing? *British Educational Research Journal*, 49(1), 1–23.
- Ansley, J., Houchins, D. E., Varjas, K., Roach, A., Patterson, D., & Hendrick, R. (2021). *The impact of an online stress intervention on burnout and teacher efficacy*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103251.
- Balbuena, S. E., & Balbuena, P. Z. (2023). Teachers' subjective wellbeing during the COVID-19 pandemic: Its relation to religiosity and trust in science. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.03.28>
- Beames, J. R., Spanos, S., Roberts, A., McGillivray, L., Li, S., Newby, J. M., O'Dea, B., & Werner-Seidler, A. (2023). *Intervention programs targeting mental health, professional burnout, and/or wellbeing of school teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09720-w>
- Chen, J., Cheng, H., Zhao, D., Zhou, F., & Chen, Y. (2023). Teachers' well-being and professional experiences in educational settings. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1186352.
- Collie, R. J. (2021). COVID-19 and teachers' somatic burden, stress, and emotional exhaustion: Examining the role of principal leadership and workplace buoyancy. *AERA Open*, 7, 1–15.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DelaCruz, M. R., & Abad, J. L. (2024). Teacher well-being and professional experiences among public school teachers in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2023). *Multivariate data analysis* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hascher, T., & Waber, J. (2023). Teacher well-being: A systematic review of the research literature. *Educational Research Review*, 39, 100482.
- Jacob Cohen. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Joseph F. Hair Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Joseph F. Hair Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kumar, R. (2023). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kurrie, L. M., & Warwas, J. (2025). Teacher well-being—A conceptual systematic review (2020–2023). *Education Sciences*, 15(6), 766.
- McCallum, F., Price, D., Graham, A., & Morrison, A. (2021). *Teacher wellbeing: A review of the literature*. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(2), 1–18.
- Montgomery, D. C., Peck, E. A., & Vining, G. G. (2021). *Introduction to linear regression analysis* (6th ed.). Wiley.
- OECD. (2023). *Teachers' well-being: Insights from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)*. OECD Publishing.
- Pagán-Castaño, E., Sánchez-García, J., Garrigós-Simón, F. J., & Guijarro-García, M. (2021). The influence of management on teacher well-being and the development of sustainable schools. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2909.
- Pressley, T. (2023). Teacher burnout and well-being in the United States: Implications for the profession. *Educational Researcher*, 52(1), 3–10.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). *Research methods for business students* (9th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). *Teacher burnout: Relations between dimensions of burnout, perceived school context, job*

- satisfaction and motivation for teaching. A longitudinal study. Teachers and Teaching, 26(7–8), 602–616.*
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1913404>
- Springer, K. W., & Hauser, R. M. (2003). An assessment of the construct validity of Ryff's scales of psychological well-being: Method, mode, and measurement effects. *Social Science Research, 32*(4), 628–651.
- Swamy, D. R., Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Rashmi, S. (2015). Quality of worklife: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences, 8*(2), 281–300.