

## The Impact of Mental and Physical Health on Employee Job Performance: A Study of University Staff

Honeylou az. Oponda, DM<sup>1</sup> | Maria Cleofe O. De los Santos, RN, RM, BSM, MN<sup>1</sup> | Arnel V. Bangis, DM<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tagoloan Community College

<sup>2</sup>Capitol University

Received 29-04-2024

Revised 30-04-2024

Accepted 21-05-2024

Published 22-05-2024



Copyright: ©2024 The Authors. Published by Publisher. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

### Abstract:

The relationship between an employee's mental and physical health and their job performance has become a vital topic in the field of human resources. This study aimed to examine the connection between these factors among teaching and non-teaching staff at a university. The research design was descriptive and correlational and data was collected using a three-part questionnaire. The results showed that the majority of the respondents were female, middle-aged, married, and held graduate or postgraduate degrees. They were also mostly tenured and in teaching positions, and reported good mental and physical health and excellent job performance. The findings suggest that educational attainment and marital status can influence mental health, but there were no significant connections found between mental and physical health and job performance. The study recommends that demographic factors should be taken into consideration when addressing employee well-being.

**Keywords:** Job performance, Mental health, Physical Well-being

### Introduction:

The well-being of employees, both mentally and physically, is crucial for the success of organizations. As stated by Nicole Renee Baptiste in her study "Tightening the link between employee wellbeing at work and performance: A new dimension for HRM", the health of organizations is dependent on the health of employees, and healthy employees perform better and contribute to organizational growth (Baptiste, 2008). The significance of employee health and happiness has been widely recognized, and most employers express a need for increased support in this area. Research has shown that healthy employees are more productive (Coleman and Borman, 2000).

Human resources are considered to be the most valuable resource in modern workplaces. This study aims to examine the relationship between employees' mental and physical health and their job performance. For employees to be dynamic, perform better, and contribute to organizational success, they must also be mentally healthy. This is the reason behind the recent approval of the Mental Health Law in the Philippines, authored by Senator Risa Hontiveros in 2018. This law places emphasis on awareness, correcting stigma and discrimination, providing support for those at risk, and facilitating access to psychosocial support in both educational institutions and workplaces.

Work performance has been widely studied for decades and is considered one of the most

important dependent variables. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) identified two types of employee behavior that are necessary for organizational effectiveness: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance refers to behaviors that directly produce goods or services or support the organization's core processes, while contextual performance involves individual efforts that shape the organizational, social, and psychological contexts and support task activities (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Werner, 2000).

The focus on health and well-being is becoming increasingly important both socially and in the field of Human Resource Management (Hancock, 2014; Deaton, 2008; National Health Federation, 2015). In recent years, employees have begun to prioritize alternative benefits and recognition strategies, such as flexible working options, medical insurance, rewards based on performance, and special prizes for fitness initiatives (Vosloban, 2013; Deloitte, 2014).

This study aims to determine the relationship between mental health, physical well-being, and job performance and develop a program to enhance these factors. The objective of the study is to improve the chosen university and its employees.

### **Theoretical Framework:**

This study is based on the Human Capital theory introduced by T. Schutz (1961) and further developed by G. Becker (1964). The theory holds that the knowledge and characteristics that workers possess contribute to their "efficiency." It allows us to consider not only years of education, but also various other aspects, such as the quality of education, training, and attitudes toward work, as part of human capital investments. According to this line of thought, employees should not be viewed as an expense, but as an asset that can not only add to their organization but in some cases, ensure its survival in today's competitive environment (Lynch, 2004). This theory is suitable for this study as the mental health and physical well-being of the respondents will be examined in relation to their job productivity. This study also draws upon the Job Demand Control Model (JDC

model) by US sociologist Robert Karasek. The model focuses on the balance between job demands and autonomy. It states that employees who experience high demands at work with little control are more likely to feel stressed compared to those who experience low demands with high control. According to Karasek (1976), the combination of strain and decision latitude offered by a job can lead to high psychological stress, and it is not solely the strain that causes it. The Job Demand Control Model takes into account the assessment of stress and stress factors in the work environment, as well as health promotion in the workplace."

### **Methodology:**

The methodology of this research is based on a descriptive correlational design. In order to gather information on the mental health, physical well-being, and socio-demographic characteristics of employees, a three-part questionnaire was adapted and used. The sample consisted of 103 participants, made up of both teaching and non-teaching staff at the university under investigation. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling, including all consenting members of the teaching and non-teaching staff at the university.

Primary data was analyzed by calculating percentages and means, and a t-test was used to assess the differences between socio-demographic characteristics and mental health, physical well-being, and job performance. Furthermore, a Pearson Product correlation was performed to examine the relationship between mental health, physical well-being, and job performance among the respondents.

This study is anchored on the Human Capital theory proposed by T. Schutz (1961) and developed by G. Becker (1964), which posits that knowledge and characteristics of a worker contribute to their efficiency. This line of thinking goes beyond just years of schooling to encompass aspects such as school quality, training, work attitudes, and more. The theory views people not as expenses on income statements, but as assets that can contribute to an organization's success or even ensure its survival in a competitive environment

**Honeylou az. Oponda et al.** The Impact of Mental and Physical Health on Employee Job Performance: A Study of University Staff (Lynch, 2004). As such, the theory is particularly relevant to this study, as it examines the impact of factors such as mental health and physical well-being on job productivity.

Additionally, this study also aligns with the Job Demand Control Model (JDC model) by US sociologist Robert Karasek, which focuses on the balance of job demands and autonomy. According to the JDC model, individuals who experience high job demands and low control are more likely to experience stress, whereas those with low demands and high control are less likely to experience stress. The model takes into account both job demands and management capabilities, as it shows that it is the combination of demands and decision latitude that leads to psychological stress, rather than just the demands alone (Karasek, 1976).

**Results and Discussions:**

**Profile of the Respondents by Age**

The data in Table 6 reveals that 51% of the respondents belonged to the middle adulthood stage, 36% were in the early adulthood stage, and 12% were in the late adulthood stage. The age range of the respondents was categorized into three groups: early adulthood (22-35), middle adulthood (36-55), and late adulthood (56 and above). The youngest respondent was 21 years old, while the oldest was 68 years old.

**Table 6 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Age**

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Early Adulthood Stage ( 21-35)	38	37
Middle Adulthood Stage (36-55)	53	51
Late Adulthood Stage (56 and above )	12	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

These findings indicate that the majority of the respondents in the study were aged 36-55, which is the largest population among the three age categories among the employees. This suggests that

middle adulthood is the stage where a majority of the employees of the university studied are at.

**Educational Attainment**

Table 7 reveals that 57% of the respondents had Doctorate or Master's degrees, while 43% had a Bachelor's degree as their highest level of educational attainment. This means that the majority of the respondents in the university studied had completed their graduate or postgraduate studies.

**Table 7 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Educational Attainment**

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Doctorate and Masteral	59	57%
Bachelor’s Degree	44	43 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>

In today's world, education plays a significant role in employment, and most employers require a certain minimum educational qualification before considering an applicant for a job (Silva, 2009).

**Civil Status:**

Table 8 indicates that 54% of the respondents from the university studied were married, while 46% were single. This means that the majority of the employees in the university studied were married.

**Table 8 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Civil Status**

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	56	54
Single	47	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

**Sex:**

Table 9 shows that 55% of the respondents from the university studied were female, while 45% were male. This could be because teaching jobs are dominated by females, and most educational institutions are manned by women (Tuason, 2002).

**Table 9 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Sex**

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	46	45
Female	57	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

**Length of Service:**

Table 10 shows that 60% of the respondents had worked at the university studied for 4 years or more, while 40% had worked for less than 4 years, with the shortest service being 9 months and the longest being 34 years at the time of the study. This implies that the majority of the employees had been working at the university for more than 4 years.

**Table 10 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Length of Service**

Length of Service	Frequency	Percentage
Below 4 years	41	40
4 years and above	62	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

Employees who have stayed long in an organization are often perceived as contented with their job and satisfied with their stay in the organization, while those who exit are believed to be dissatisfied and in search of better opportunities that can fulfill their employment needs. Furthermore, several years of service within an organization suggest a maintainable employer-employee relationship and the ability to achieve the organization's goals (Yeatts and Hyten, 1998).

**Status of Employment:**

Table 11 shows that 62% of the respondents were tenured, while 38% were non-tenured. These results reveal that the majority of the respondents in the university were on a permanent basis.

**Table 11 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Status of Employment**

Status of Employment	Frequency	Percentage
Tenured	64	62
Non-tenured	39	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

The teaching employees in the university studied have a longer probationary period, with tenureship being granted after three years of very satisfactory job performance. On the other hand, the non-teaching staff is given tenureship after six months of very satisfactory job performance. Tenure is a crucial aspect of the direct employer-employee interface (Yeatts and Hyten, 1998).

**Employment Position:**

Table 12 indicates that 59% of the respondents were from the teaching group, while 41% were from the non-teaching group. This is due to the fact that there are more employees from the teaching department than in the non-teaching department in the university studied

**Table 12 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents by Employment Position**

Employment Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching	61	59
Non-Teaching	42	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>

**Employees Mental Health Status:**

The mental health status of employees was assessed using the Mental Health Inventory score, as shown in Table 13. 88% of the respondents were classified as having good mental health, with a score of 67 or more. 10% of the respondents had a score of 61 or lower and were classified as having fair mental health, while 2% had a score between 62-66 and were classified as having better mental health. All items in the 18 item questionnaire were rated as "good," indicating positive responses to questions about overall well-being. The overall score was 78.2, which is considered a good mental health status

**Table 13 Mean Distribution of Respondents’ Mental Health Status**

<b>Mental Health Status</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Frequenc y</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fair	61 and below	10	10
Better	62-66	2	2
Good	67 and above	91	88
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>During the last 4 weeks</b>		<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
1.* Has your daily life been full of things that were interesting to you?		77.3	All of the time
2. Did you feel Depressed?		77.9	None of the time
3.* Have you felt loved and wanted?		80.2	All of the time
4. Have you been a very nervous person?		80.6	None of the time
5.* Have you been in firm control of your behavior, thoughts, emotions, feelings?		74.0	All of the time
6. Have you felt tense or high-strung?		75.3	None of the time
7.* Have you felt calm and peaceful?		80.0	All of the time
8.* Have you felt emotionally stable?		81.0	All of the time
9. Have you felt downhearted and blue?		76.1	None of the time
10.* Were you able to relax without difficulty?		74.6	All of the time
11. Have you felt restless, fidgety, or impatient?		74.0	None of the time
12. Have you been moody, or brooded about things?		72.6	None of the time
13.* Have you felt cheerful, light-hearted?		79.2	All of the time
14. Have you been in low or very low spirits?		78.4	None of the time
15. *Were you a happy person?		84.3	All of the time
16. Did you feel you had nothing to look forward to?		79.6	None of the time
17. Have you felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?		87.7	None of the time
18. Have you been anxious or worried?		75.7	None of the time
<b>Over-all result</b>		<b>78.2</b>	<b>Good mental health</b>

Legend \*Reverse code includes assigning each item responses scores as below- All of the time =

6, Most of the time = 5, A good bit of the time = 4, some of the time = 3, A little of the time = 2, none of the time = 1



The majority of employees have good mental health and do not require counseling or assistance. However, those who rated their mental health as better or fair could benefit from support and guidance. Mental health is a crucial aspect of one's overall well-being, encompassing the individual's ability to effectively and happily fulfill their role in society and within a group. It is shaped by daily experiences and is not limited to just the "mind," but rather is a reflection of one's entire life.

**Employees Physical Well-being**

Table 14 displays the results of the physical well-being of employees. 62% of the respondents were found to have a very good physical well-being, while 29% had good physical well-being, 7% rated their physical well-being as poor, and 2% rated it as fair. Out of the 15 indicators in the questionnaire, 6 items were rated "very good" (never experiencing symptoms), while the rest were rated as "good"

(sometimes experiencing symptoms). The weighted mean was rated as "very good."

Most employees were found to be in good physical health, and respondents credited the physical environment of the university for contributing to their well-being. A healthy lifestyle, including physical exercise, a balanced diet, and a positive social life, is critical to one's physical health. Additionally, the annual physical examination conducted by the university clinic helped to monitor and raise awareness about employees' physical health.

Physical well-being is not just the absence of disease, but rather a balance between physical, mental, and spiritual well-being. Physical wellness is the ability to maintain a healthy quality of life that allows an individual to perform daily activities without undue stress or fatigue.

**Table 14 Status of Physical Well being**

Physical wellbeing	Range	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	1.0- 1.75	7	7
Fair	1.76- 2.450	2	2
Good	2.51- 3.25	30	29
Very good	2.26- 4.0	64	62
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>
Indicators	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1. I feel generalized pain (back pain etc.)	3.0	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
2. I feel headaches of any sort.	3.02	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
3. I experience stiffness in my neck, shoulders, jaws, stomach or legs.	3.18	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
4. I tremble or I experience nervousness.	3.38	Symptom has not been experienced	Very good physical health condition

5. I experience difficulty breathing at times.	3.43	Symptom has not been experienced	Very good physical health condition
6. I experience lump on my throat.	3.54	Symptom has not been experienced	Very good physical health condition

Indicators	Mean	Description	Interpretation
7. I have diarrhea or constipation when stress.	3.36	Symptom has not been experienced	Very good physical health condition
8. I experience difficulty falling or staying asleep.	3.09	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
9. My hands or feet are cold when I am in stress.	3.24	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
10. I perspire excessively.	3.26	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
11. I am irritable and get angry easily.	3.20	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
12. I wake up feeling tired.	3.16	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
13. I experienced increased tension, worry, anxiety, or restlessness.	3.20	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
14. I suffer from excessive, heartbeat thumping, or racing.	3.45	Symptom has not been experienced	Very good physical health condition
15. I get dizzy or light headed.	3.22	Symptom has been experienced perhaps once a month	Good physical health condition
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.25</b>		<b>Good</b>

**Employees Level of Performance:**

Table 15 provides findings from secondary data from the university's guidance center about the employees' level of performance. 73% of the respondents were rated as excellent, with a mean of 4.15. 25% were rated as very satisfactory, with a mean of 3.80, and 2% were rated as fair, with a mean of 2.8. The total weighted mean of 3.58 is interpreted as very satisfactory. Criteria evaluated

included professional competence, professional skills and work performance, school and community service, 5S management, and personal and interpersonal skills. The researcher was only given the overall rating of each respondent, so specific criteria indicators were not available.

Employee performance is a crucial aspect of work behavior and is considered to be synonymous with overall job performance. It

Honeylou az. Oponda et al. The Impact of Mental and Physical Health on Employee Job Performance: A Study of University Staff involves the efficient and effective execution of tasks in order to achieve the predetermined objectives of an organization. Armstrong and Baron (2004) defined employee performance as the development of individual and team capabilities in order to harness their potential contributions to both personal and organizational goals.

**Table 15 Level of Job Performance**

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Interpretation of mean
4.21 - 5.00	79	73	4.15	Very satisfactory
3.41- 4.20	26	25	3.80	Very Satisfactory
2.61 - 3.40	2	2	2.8	Fair
1.81 - 2.60	0	0	0	None
1.00 - 1.80	0	0	0	None
Total	<b>103</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>Very satisfactory</b>

**Significant Differences in the Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance and the Profile of the Respondents**

The results from Table 16 indicate that there was no significant difference in the respondents' level of mental health, physical well-being, and job performance based on their age. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Hedge and Borman (2012) challenge the notion that age has any impact on performance. They claim that age is a very weak predictor of performance and that relying on it as a factor in making employee decisions is a default approach

with no basis in truth. The relationship between age and performance deserves closer examination.

According to Hedge and Borman (2012), employee performance tends to decline as workers get older. However, Hedge and Borman (2009) also believe that employers can benefit from an aging workforce by addressing their aging-related needs and leveraging their strengths such as experience and creativity.

Burlacu (2012) highlights that due to the rapidly changing work environment, employers in developing nations are encountering a more diverse range of ages among their employees, leading to a diversity in performance.

**Table 16 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance by Age**

Scores	T	P	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Level of Mental Health	1.97	0.052	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	0.85	0.396	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Job Performance	0.86	0.394	Accept	Not Significant

*\*significance at p= <.05*

Andoh, Biako and Afranie (2011) also point out that the idea of age is looked at from different

points of view by different people. There are those who see old age as an amassing of experience and



knowledge hence a contributory factor to the ability to perform better. On the contrary, there are those who relate old age to wearing out, tiredness, increased family and other social responsibilities and vulnerability to diseases which are contributory factors to low work.

Hedge and Borman (2012) argue against age as an element to performance. They say that age is a very weak predictor of performance and that those who make employee decisions based on age can be looked at as default decision makers who do not ascribe to any coherent form of truth. The issue of age therefore calls for much attention as far as performance of employees is concerned.

Hedge and Borman (2012) say that employee performance tends to go slow as the employee grow older. Hedge and Borman (2009) also argued that employers can as well benefit from the aging workforce by taking care of their needs that are related to aging and capitalizing on their strengths such as experience and innovation.

Burlacu (2012) points out that due to the rapidly changing work environment, employers within

developing nations are experiencing growing diversities in the age structure of their employees, hence diversity in performance.

**Table 17** shows no significant differences in physical well-being and job performance based on educational attainment.

However, there is a significant difference in the level of mental health status between those with high and low educational attainment. Respondents who have completed a doctorate or master's degree have a higher level of mental health status compared to those with only a bachelor's degree. According to Williams (2002), education level or qualification is positively associated with mental performance, suggesting that more educated employees are more likely to perform well. The importance of education qualifications is emphasized in job advertisements, making it a crucial factor in employee performance. Easterlin (2007) also points out that the skills gained through education are a mark of an employee's performance level. Different fields of specialization are necessary to meet the labor needs in universities.

**Table 17 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance by Educational Attainment**

Scores	T	P	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Level of Mental Health	2.393	0.019	Reject	Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	0.341	0.734	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Job Performance	0.207	0.837	Accept	Not Significant

*\*significance at p= <.05*

According to Easterlin (2007) the skills gained through education are a mark of performance level that an employee can exhibit. However, different fields of specialization are needed in order to meet the labor needs within the universities.

Table 18 reveals no significant differences in job performance based on civil status, but there is a significant difference in mental health status and physical well-being between single and married

respondents. The married respondents have higher ratings in both mental health status and physical well-being compared to single respondents. According to Williams (1992), married individuals are less likely to have mental health issues, and they have higher levels of emotional and psychological well-being than those who are single or divorced (Brown 2003). Marriage provides protection against feelings of loneliness.

**Table 18 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance by Civil Status**

Scores	T	P	Decision on ho	Interpretation
Level of Mental Health	2.285	0.0245	Reject	Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	2.113	0.0371	Reject	Significant
Level of Job Performance	0.835	0.405	Accept	Not Significant

\*significance at  $p = <.05$

Marriage also has a wide range of benefits for physical health (Hahn 1993).

Table 19 reveals that there is no correlation between the length of service in the university and

the level of mental health, physical well-being, or job performance. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted.

**Table 19 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance by Length of Employment**

Scores	T	P	Decision on ho	Interpretation
Level of Mental Health	0.931	0.354	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	0.686	0.494	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Job Performance	1.024	0.309	Accept	Not Significant

\*significance at  $p = <.05$

However, Yeatts and Hyten (1998) argue that the amount of time spent in an institution can influence

an individual's performance. Further insights and discussions are needed to explore this idea.

**Table 20 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance by Sex**

Scores	T	P	Decision on ho	Interpretation
Level Of Mental Health	0.517	0.607	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	0.824	0.412	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Job Performance	0.154	0.878	Accept	Not Significant

\*significance at  $p = <.05$

Women are coming out to prove that they can equally perform as well as men, or even better (Fletchl, V. 2010) Table 20 indicated that there

was no statistically significant difference in the level of mental health, physical well-being, and job performance between the sexes. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

**Table 21 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-being and Level of Performance by Employment Position**

Scores	T	P	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Level Of Mental Health	1.34	0.184	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	1.19	0.237	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Job Performance	0.41	0.681	Accept	Not Significant

*\*significance at p= <.05*

Table 22 indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of mental health, physical well-being, or job performance between tenured and non-tenured employees, thus the null hypothesis is accepted. Furthermore, Table 23 suggests that there is no significant correlation between the level of mental health and job performance, as indicated by a correlation coefficient of  $r(101)=0.124$  and a p-value greater than 0.05. This supports the null hypothesis and indicates that there is no significant relationship between mental health and job performance. Table 24 similarly shows that there is no significant relationship between physical well-being and job performance, with a correlation coefficient of  $r(101)=0.021$  and a p-value greater than 0.05. The lack of significant relationship implies that physical well-being is not a significant predictor of job performance.

**Table 22 Test of Difference in Level of Mental Health and Physical Well-bein and Level of Performance by Employment Status**

Scores	T	P	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Level of Mental Health	1.86	0.066	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Physical Well-being	0.51	0.612	Accept	Not Significant
Level of Job Performance	0.34	0.736	Accept	Not Significant

*\*significance at p= <.05*

**Significant Relationship between the Level of Mental Health and Job Performance**

Table 23 shows that there is no significant positive relationship between the level of mental health of employees and their job performance,  $r(101)=0.124$ , p is greater than 0.05. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significant relationship between job performance and level of mental health.

**Table 23 Relationship between the Level of Mental Health and Their Job Performance**

		Level of Mental Health of Employees
Job Performance	Pearson Correlation (r)	0.124
	P-value	0.211
	N	103
Interpretation		No relationship

*\*significance at p= <.05*

The implication is that the level of mental health is not a factor as determinants to performance achievement among employees.

**Significant Relationship between the Level of Physical Well-being and Job Performance**

Table 24 shows that there is no significant positive relationship between the physical well-

being of employees and their jobperformance,  $r(101)=0.021$ ,  $p$  is greater than 0.05. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significant relationship between job performance and level of physical well- being. The implication is that level of physical well-being is not a factor as determinants to performance achievement among employees.

**Table 24 Relationship between the Level of Physical Well-Being Their Job Performance**

		Physical well-being of Employees
Job Performance	Pearson Correlation (r)	0.021
	P-value	.0.835
	N	103
	Interpretation	No relationship

\*significance at  $p= <.05$

**Conclusions:**

The study's findings highlight the demographic characteristics of the respondents, who were primarily female, in their middle age, married, and with a graduate or postgraduate education. A majority of the respondents were tenured and working in a teaching position, and they reported generally good levels of mental health and physical well-being. Furthermore, the performance evaluations of the respondents largely rated them as excellent.

One of the key findings of the study is the positive association between educational attainment and mental health. According to the study results, those who pursued higher levels of education (e.g., graduate or postgraduate studies) had a higher level of mental health compared to those who only completed a bachelor's degree. Additionally, the study found that civil status also played a role in mental health and physical well-being, with married employees reporting higher levels of both compared to single employees.

Despite these relationships between demographic factors and well-being, the study did not find any significant relationships between mental health and physical well-being and job performance. These results suggest that, at least

according to this study, mental health and physical well-being may not be significant determinants of job performance.

It's worth noting that the limitations of this study, such as the sample size and location, may affect the generalizability of these findings to other populations. Further research may also explore other factors that may influence job performance, such as job demands, social support, and individual characteristics (e.g., personality, motivation).

**References:**

1. Armstrong, M. (2000), Performance Management: Key Strategies and Practical Guidance's, Kogan Page, London.
2. Bacon, D. (1989), "Business's Role in War on Drugs, Nation's Business", January, p.5.
3. Bass, Jossey (1997) Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. Human Performance, 10(2): 99-109
4. Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds), Personnel selection in organizations

- (pp. 71–98). New York: Jossey-Bass
- Experiences of mental illness stigma, prejudice and discrimination: a review of measures
5. Brohan, Elaine, (2010) “Experiences of mental illness stigma, prejudice and discrimination: a review of measures” BMC Health Services Research
  6. Brown, Susan L. (2003) “Relationship Quality Dynamics of Cohabiting Unions,” Journal of Family Issues 24, no.5
  7. Borman, W. C. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1993) Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In Personnel Selection in Organizations (N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman, eds), pp. 71-98.
  8. Coleman, V.I., & Borman, W.C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. Human Resource Management Review, 10(2), 24–44.
  9. Denison R. Daniel & Mishra K. Anil (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. Organization science. Vol. 6, No. 2, March-April 1995.
  10. Fletchl, V. (2010). Work Life Balance - A comparative Study of Women in Senior Management Positions in Austria, Denmark and Great Britain. Norderstedt: GRIN Verlag.
  11. Hancock, C. (2014) 'Launch of a new workplace health movement'. Occupational Health. Journal
  12. Hontiveros, Risa Republic Act No. 11036 known as the “Mental Health Law in the Philippines “ (2018)
  13. Karasek, Robert (1976) Demand/Control Model: a Social, Emotional, and Physiological Approach to Stress Risk and Active Behaviour
  14. Lynch, Richard (2004)” Strategy Development in UK Higher Education: Towards Resource-Based Competitive Advantages” Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management Vol. 26, No. 2, July 2004, 171-187.
  15. Schultz, T. (1961) Investment in Human Capital. The American Economic Review, 51, 1-17.
  16. Vosloban, RalucaIoana (2013)” The Influence of the Employee's Performance on the Company's Growth - A Managerial Perspective”; Academic research paper on "Economics and business"; Deloitte Insights
  17. Williams, D, et al, “Marital Status and Psychiatric Disorders Among Blacks and Whites”, Journal of Health and Social Behavior 33