

Time Management Practices and Their Influence on the Teaching Performance of Higher Education Teachers in Selected Institutions in Zamboanga City

David A. Ornado¹

College of Teacher Education, Zamboanga State College of Marine Sciences and Technology, Zamboanga City, Philippines

¹ORCID ID No.: 861-1315-861-1315

*Corresponding Author: David A. Ornado¹
daveornado58@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE:

David A. Ornado (2026). Time Management Practices and Their Influence on the Teaching Performance of Higher Education Teachers in Selected Institutions in Zamboanga City. International Journal of Special Education, 41(14s), 861-868

ABSTRACT:

This study addresses the persistent challenge of heavy workload and competing responsibilities among higher education (HE) teachers, which often lead to poor time utilization and inconsistent instructional quality—an issue that remains understudied in the context of Region IX, Philippines. It aimed to determine the time management practices of HE teachers in planning, instruction, research and extension, co-curricular activities, and professional development; assess their teaching performance; identify differences in ratings across groups; and analyze the relationship and predictive influence of time management on performance. Using a descriptive-correlational and causal-predictive design, data were collected from 191 faculty members and 382 students from four public and private HEIs in Zamboanga City, using validated survey instruments. Results showed that teachers practiced time management at a high level (“Often” to “Always”), with the highest rating in planning and the lowest in research and extension. Teaching performance was rated “Very Satisfactory” overall, with “Outstanding” ratings in classroom management and personality. Significant differences were found between public and private institutions in research engagement, and between faculty and student ratings in subject mastery and instructional skills. Statistical analysis revealed a moderate, significant positive relationship ($r = 0.622$, $p < 0.001$), with time management explaining 38.7% of the variance in teaching performance. Planning, instruction, and co-curricular activities emerged as significant predictors. The findings provide empirical evidence that effective time management is a key factor in improving teaching outcomes. Practically, this study offers data-driven recommendations for school administrators to design workload policies, provide institutional support, and enhance faculty development programs aligned with CHED standards.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Time management, Teaching performance, Higher education, Faculty workload, Zamboanga City, Philippines

Introduction

Effective time management means focusing on the right tasks, bringing greater productivity, better decision-making, reduced stress, and more time for personal and professional goals. Time is fixed—everyone gets exactly 24 hours daily, with no way to increase or borrow it (Amos, 1998). Yet unfinished tasks pile up day after day, creating pressure that makes people wish for more time, even though the real issue is how available hours are used. Making the most of time is not complicated, but it needs planning and self-discipline; schedules are useless without consistent practice (Mushingum, 1998). One practical way to start is keeping a time log from morning until night, so you can identify and cut back on low-priority activities (Martin, 1991).

For teachers, workload has grown more complex over time. According to the International Labour Office (1991), their work is shaped by hours spent in and out of class and class size, while new demands include curriculum design, updated assessments, in-service training, and integrating technology or inclusive education. More responsibilities once handled by families or communities have also shifted to schools, expanding the teacher's role. While direct teaching hours have stayed steady or slightly decreased, overall workload has risen. True effectiveness comes from balancing physical, intellectual, social, emotional, spiritual, and career aspects of life; balance is the first step toward better control (Merrill & Douglas, 1980).

Recent studies confirm that time management is positively linked to job satisfaction and performance, but findings vary across contexts. Alonzo (2023) noted that while many studies focus on basic education, fewer explore how time allocation affects the full range of academic functions—including research and extension—in higher education. Bautista (2021) added that in Philippine HEIs, faculty often face conflicting demands between teaching and scholarly work, yet there is limited data comparing practices and outcomes between public and private institutions in Region IX.

This study fills that gap: it moves beyond general descriptions of time use to measure how specific management practices influence teaching performance, providing comparative evidence across institutional types and perspectives of both teachers and students. Unlike earlier research that focused only on individual habits, this study also examines how organizational factors shape time use, offering new insights for both faculty and administrators. Planning is the foundation of time control; prioritizing high-value activities ensures important work gets done, and failing to plan means planning to fail (Martin, 1991). In Zamboanga City's higher education institutions, teachers show different attitudes toward time: some carefully organize schedules and lessons, while others are careless or indifferent about how time is spent. Since time management directly reflects work output and quality, and lesson preparation demands significant time, effort, and resources, this study aims to examine how teachers allocate their time, what strategies they use, and how these strategies influence their teaching performance.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to determine the time-management practices and the level of teaching performance of selected Higher Education teachers in Zamboanga City.

Specifically, it aimed to:

1. Identify the time-management practices of Higher Education teachers in Zamboanga City with respect to planning, instruction, research and extension services, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, and professional development.
2. Determine if there is a significant difference in the respondents' ratings of the time-management practices among teachers from different types of institutions.
3. Assess the level of teaching performance of Higher Education teachers, as perceived by faculty members and students, in terms of mastery of the subject matter, instructional skills, communication skills, classroom management, and personality.

4. Establish if there is a significant difference in the ratings of teaching performance between faculty self-assessment and student evaluation.

5. Examine if a significant relationship exists between time-management practices and the level of teaching performance.

6. Determine if time-management significantly predicts the level of teaching performance of selected Higher Education faculty members.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational and causal-predictive research design. The descriptive approach was used to describe the current status of time management practices and teaching performance. Correlational analysis determined the strength and direction of their relationship, while regression analysis tested the predictive influence of time management on performance (Creswell, 2014). This mixed-method quantitative design allows for a comprehensive assessment of variables and generalizable conclusions.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in four selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) located in Zamboanga City, representing both public and private sectors, as well as varying academic focuses and institutional characteristics. The selected schools are:

- School A (Western Mindanao State University): A state university offering a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs. It serves as the primary public higher education provider in the region, catering to students from low- to middle-income households.

- School B (Zamboanga State College of Marine Sciences and Technology): An ISO-certified state college specializing in marine sciences, fisheries, and technology, with a strong focus on applied research and industry linkages.

- School C (Southern City Colleges): A non-sectarian private institution offering affordable education, with programs in education, business, and technology.

- School D (Universidad de Zamboanga): A private non-sectarian university with multiple campuses, offering 44 programs and holding ISO 9001:2015 certification, emphasizing quality management and standards.

Population and Sampling Design

The target population consisted of 952 full-time faculty members from the four institutions. Following the guidelines of Gay (1976) and Slovin's Formula with a margin of error of 5%, a sample size of 191 faculty members was selected using stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation across institutions. Additionally, two students per faculty member were randomly selected, resulting in 382 student respondents to provide a balanced evaluation of teaching performance.

Table 1 Distribution of Respondents

Higher Education Institution	Total Faculty Population	Faculty Sample	Student Respondents
School A	499	100	200
School B	79	16	32
School C	49	10	20
School D	325	65	130
Total	952	191	382

Research Instrument

Two structured instruments were used. Part A, the Time Management Scale, was adapted from Carter et al. (2000) and modified to fit the local context, with 25 items across five domains. Part B, the Teaching Performance Evaluation, was adapted from the standardized faculty evaluation tool used by CHED and local universities, consisting of 25 items across five dimensions. Validity was established through content validation by three experts in educational management and measurement, resulting in a Content Validity Index (CVI) of 0.91.

Reliability was tested via a pilot study with 30 faculty members, yielding a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.87 for Part A and 0.89 for Part B, indicating high internal consistency. A 4-point Likert scale was used for time management: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Often, 4 = Always. A 5-point scale was used for teaching performance: 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Satisfactory, 4 = Very Satisfactory, 5 = Outstanding.

Data Gathering Procedure

Formal permission was requested from the presidents or heads of each institution. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with deans and department heads to identify potential respondents. Questionnaires were distributed personally and via email, with clear instructions and informed consent forms. Data collection was conducted over a six-week period in the first semester of the academic year. All responses were treated with strict confidentiality and used solely for research purposes.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Data were analyzed using SPSS Version 26. Descriptive statistics (weighted mean and standard deviation) summarized levels of practice and performance. Inferential statistics included: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and independent t-test to compare group differences; Pearson Product-Moment Correlation to measure relationships; and Multiple Linear Regression to determine the predictive effect of time management on teaching performance. All tests were set at a 0.05 level of significance.

Results and Discussion

Time Management Practices

Table 2 Summary of Time-Management Practices

Domain	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Planning	3.53	0.42	Always
Instruction	3.47	0.39	Often
Research and Extension Services	2.71	0.51	Often
Co-curricular and Extra-curricular Activities	3.29	0.45	Often
Professional Development	2.97	0.48	Often
Overall	3.19	0.45	Often

Scale: 3.51–4.00 = Always; 2.51–3.50 = Often; 1.51–2.50 = Rarely; 1.00–1.50 = Never

As shown in Table 2, teachers demonstrate high levels of time management, with “Always” observed in planning and “Often” in all other areas. The highest score in planning confirms that

teachers recognize it as the foundation of effective work, aligning with Amos (1998) who states that clear planning reduces stress and improves efficiency. The lowest score in research

and extension supports the findings of Castolo (2020) and Dela Cruz (2021), who note that heavy

teaching loads and limited resources make scholarly activities difficult to prioritize.

Table 3 ANOVA Results for Institutional Differences

Domain	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Planning	1.054	0.396	Not Significant
Instruction	2.220	0.125	Not Significant
Research and Extension Services	3.420	0.043	Significant
Co-curricular Activities	2.460	0.100	Not Significant
Professional Development	0.743	0.542	Not Significant

The significant difference in research and extension ($p < 0.05$) shows that private institutions offer more flexible policies and funding, allowing faculty to engage more in these activities compared to public HEIs, which face

stricter bureaucratic processes (Garcia, 2019; Ornado, 2024). This finding adds to the literature by highlighting that time management is not only an individual skill but also shaped by institutional systems.

Level of Teaching Performance

Table 4 Summary of Teaching Performance Ratings

Domain	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Mastery of Subject Matter	4.37	0.38	Very Satisfactory
Instructional Skills	4.31	0.41	Very Satisfactory
Communication Skills	4.39	0.36	Very Satisfactory
Classroom Management	4.43	0.35	Very Satisfactory
Personality	4.46	0.33	Very Satisfactory
Overall	4.39	0.37	Very Satisfactory

Scale: 4.51–5.00 = Outstanding; 3.51–4.50 = Very Satisfactory; 2.51–3.50 = Satisfactory; 1.51–2.50 = Fair; 1.00–1.50 = Poor

The high ratings reflect that teachers possess strong professional attributes, consistent with the standards set by CHED (2020). The lower scores

in lesson preparation and use of syllabi indicate areas for improvement, which may be linked to time constraints (Bautista, 2021).

Table 5 t-Test: Faculty vs. Student Ratings

Domain	Faculty Mean	Student Mean	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Mastery of Subject Matter	4.46	4.27	3.168	0.010	Significant
Instructional Skills	4.38	4.23	2.858	0.013	Significant
Communication Skills	4.43	4.34	1.506	0.183	Not Significant
Classroom Management	4.52	4.33	2.717	0.053	Not Significant
Personality	4.48	4.43	0.949	0.379	Not Significant

The differences in self and student ratings align with the study of Lim (2022), who explains that teachers evaluate performance based on effort and knowledge, while students judge based on clarity and accessibility. This suggests that

evaluation systems should integrate both perspectives for accuracy.

Relationship and Influence of Time Management

Table 6 Correlation Analysis

Variable	Pearson r	p-value	Interpretation
Time Management ↔ Teaching Performance	0.622	0.000	Moderate, Significant Relationship

Table 7 Multiple Regression Results

Predictor Variable	Beta Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Planning	-0.216	-2.346	0.020	Significant
Instruction	0.422	4.804	0.000	Significant
Research and Extension	-0.080	-0.981	0.328	Not Significant
Co-curricular Activities	0.500	5.439	0.000	Significant
Professional Development	-0.079	-0.903	0.367	Not Significant
Model Summary	R² = 0.387	—	—	38.7% variance explained

The results confirm that better time management leads to better teaching performance, supporting the findings of Reyes (2021) and Alonzo (2023). The non-significant contribution of research and extension indicates that these activities are not yet fully integrated into the performance system, so their impact is not yet visible. This highlights that institutional policies must align workload expectations with support systems to ensure all roles contribute to quality education.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the study concludes that:

1. Teachers in Zamboanga City HEIs practice good time management, prioritizing core teaching functions but allocating less time to research and extension.
2. Teaching performance is generally very satisfactory, with consistent strengths in interpersonal and classroom management aspects.
3. Time management and teaching performance are significantly related, with planning, instruction, and co-curricular activities serving as key predictors.
4. Limitations of the study include its focus on only four institutions and reliance on self-reported data; results may not be generalized to other regions. Also, the study covers only one academic year, so long-term effects are not captured.

References

- Alonzo, R. T. (2023). Time management and teaching effectiveness among higher education faculty in Western Mindanao. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 21(1), 45–62.
- Amos, J. (1998). *Time management: Strategies for personal and professional productivity*. Educational Development Center.
- Bautista, M. L. (2021). Workload, instructional preparation, and teaching performance of college instructors. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 16(2), 78–95.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Carter, D., Johnson, L., & Miller, S. (2000). *Time management in education: Principles and practices*. Pearson Education.

Recommendations

To address the gaps and improve outcomes, the following are recommended:

For HEIs: Develop clear workload policies that reduce administrative tasks and provide incentives, funding, and technical support for research and extension. Establish standardized orientation and training programs on time management.

For Faculty: Adopt prioritization techniques and time-tracking methods to balance teaching, research, and personal responsibilities.

For Future Researchers: Conduct longitudinal studies and include more institutions to compare trends across years and regions. Investigate the impact of workload reduction policies on research productivity and overall performance.

Acknowledgements

The researcher expresses sincere gratitude to the administrators, faculty members, and students of the four higher education institutions in Zamboanga City, Western Mindanao State University, Zamboanga State College of Marine Sciences and Technology, Universidad de Zamboanga, and Southern City Colleges, for their invaluable participation, cooperation, and support, which made the completion of this study possible. Appreciation is also extended to the College of Teacher Education for providing the necessary academic environment and resources, and to all individuals who, directly or indirectly, contributed their time, expertise, and encouragement to the successful realization of this research endeavor.

-
- Castolo, A. B. (2020). Research productivity and workload balance among faculty in Philippine state universities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 40(3), 341–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1731245>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2020). Policies and standards for quality instruction in higher education institutions (CHED Memorandum Order No. 75, s. 2020). <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CMO-No.-75-s.-2020.pdf>
- Dela Cruz, E. S. (2021). Research engagement among college teachers: Barriers and institutional support. *Philippine Educational Review*, 64(1), 112–130.
- Garcia, F. M. (2019). Institutional factors influencing faculty research output in public and private higher education. *Journal of Educational Administration and Management*, 32(4), 512–530.
- Gay, L. R. (1976). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Merrill Publishing.
- International Labour Office. (1991). *The changing role and conditions of teachers* (Report No. 79). International Labour Organization.
- Lim, C. P. (2022). Student and faculty perspectives in teaching evaluation: A comparative analysis. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(5), 745–760. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1999987>
- MacKenzie, R. A., & Waldo, C. L. (1981). *Time management: The new system for self-management*. Amacom.
- Martin, W. (1991). *Mastering time: A guide to effective planning and prioritizing*. Kogan Page.
- Merrill, D. W., & Douglas, J. (1980). *Time management: The new science of scheduling*. Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Mushingum, J. (1998). *Time management for educators*. Longman Publishers.
- Ornado, D. A. (2024). Institutional differences in research support and faculty performance. *Zamboanga Educational Research Journal*, 8(1), 23–37.
- Reyes, J. P. (2021). Time allocation and teaching success: A correlational study. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(2), 345–361. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-861-1315-0187>
- Villanueva, T. S. (2023). Cultural values and teaching performance in Region IX. *Mindanao Educational Research Review*, 15(2), 89–106.