

Quality of Life in the Hybrid Work Era: A Filipino Employee-Centered Evaluation in a Philippine Government Agency

¹Frederick P. Potente, ¹Harold Victor S. Marcelo, ¹Florimel R. Gillette, ¹Larmina Malaki

¹Philippine Christian University, Philippines

Received 26th October 2025; Accepted 13th December 2025; Published Online 29th January 2026

DOI: 10.63941/DIT.ADSimrj.2026.2.1.27

ABSTRACT

The transition to hybrid work arrangements has significantly transformed the work experience of employees across organizations, particularly in government agencies. This study evaluated the quality of life of Filipino employees in a Philippine government agency within the context of the hybrid work era. Using a quantitative research design, data were collected from 150 employees through a structured questionnaire assessing work-life balance, mental and physical well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational support under hybrid work conditions. Descriptive statistics were employed to determine the levels of employee quality of life, while inferential analyses explored the relationship between hybrid work factors and overall well-being. Results revealed that employees generally reported moderate to high levels of quality of life, with work-life balance and organizational support being the strongest contributors. Challenges such as workload management, digital fatigue, and limited interpersonal interaction were identified as potential areas affecting well-being. The study highlights the importance of adaptive policies, employee-centered support systems, and structured hybrid work practices in enhancing the quality of life of government employees.

Keywords: *Quality of Life, Hybrid Work, Employee Well-being, Government Agency, Work-Life Balance, Organizational Support*

INTRODUCTION

The shift toward hybrid work arrangements has become one of the most significant transformations in workplace dynamics in the post-pandemic era. Hybrid work, which typically combines remote and office work, emerged as a dominant model as organizations sought to balance flexibility with operational needs following COVID 19 lockdowns. Research suggests that hybrid work can enhance employee well-being, job satisfaction, and productivity by allowing greater autonomy and reduced commuting time, while also posing challenges related to communication and organizational culture (Barreto, 2025). In the Philippines, workers have reported improvements in various well-being dimensions under hybrid arrangements, including work-life balance, financial savings, and productivity (Philippine Star; Cisco Global Hybrid Work Study, 2022). These developments raise important questions about how hybrid work impacts the quality of life of employees in different sectors, especially within the public sector, where traditional office-based work has long prevailed.

Quality of life in the workplace encompasses multiple dimensions, including physical, emotional, social, and financial well-being. Work-life balance, a key component of quality of life, has been shown to improve significantly under hybrid arrangements, as employees gain more control over their schedules and reduce time spent commuting (Philippine Star; Cisco Hybrid Work research, 2022). In the Philippine context, hybrid work has enabled employees to save both time and money, with many workers reporting up to four to eight additional hours per week that can be devoted to personal and family life (Philippine Star, 2022). Furthermore, enhanced flexibility in work location and schedule may support better mental and physical health outcomes by facilitating exercise and leisure activities, which are often sacrificed under rigid work schedules. These findings highlight the potential of hybrid

work to positively influence overall employee well being and contribute to a more sustainable work environment.

Despite the potential benefits, hybrid work also presents challenges that may affect employees' quality of life. Studies indicate that difficulties such as blurred boundaries between work and personal time, communication barriers, and feelings of isolation can emerge in hybrid settings, particularly when organizational support structures are inadequate (Barreto, 2025; Journal of Academic Science, 2025). These challenges demonstrate that hybrid work does not automatically equate to improved well being; instead, its impact depends on how effectively organizations manage flexibility, provide clear communication, and support employee engagement. The hybrid model requires organizations to rethink policies, human resource practices, and leadership strategies that foster inclusion, teamwork, and professional growth, even in dispersed work environments.

In the Philippine government sector, the adoption of hybrid work arrangements has gained momentum, with agencies such as the Civil Service Commission implementing flexible work policies to support employee morale and productivity (Manila Bulletin, 2024). This shift reflects broader efforts to modernize public sector work practices and address long standing issues such as traffic congestion, work overload, and limited time for personal responsibilities. However, there remains a gap in empirical research examining the quality of life of Filipino public sector employees within hybrid work systems, particularly regarding how these arrangements affect their well being, job satisfaction, and organizational experiences. Understanding these impacts is critical for designing effective workplace policies that sustain employee welfare and organizational performance.

Given these dynamics, this study aims to evaluate the quality of life of Filipino employees in a Philippine government agency during the hybrid work era. By focusing on employee perceptions of work life balance, well being, job satisfaction, and organizational support, the research seeks to provide insights into both the benefits and challenges of hybrid work in the public sector. The findings are expected to inform policymakers, human resource practitioners, and government leaders on how to enhance employee quality of life and develop supportive hybrid work frameworks that align with the needs of Filipino workers.

MATERIALS & METHODS

This study employed a quantitative research design to evaluate the quality of life of Filipino employees in a Philippine government agency under hybrid work arrangements. The research focused on employee-centered assessment of work-life balance, mental and physical well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational support. A purposive sampling technique was used to select employees who have experienced hybrid work for at least six months, ensuring that respondents could provide relevant insights on their work experiences. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire with Likert-scale items, which was validated through a pilot test to ensure clarity, reliability, and relevance.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Means and standard deviations were computed to determine the levels of employee quality of life, while Pearson's correlation and multiple regression analyses were used to examine relationships between hybrid work factors and overall well-being. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS software. Ethical considerations were strictly observed, including informed consent, voluntary participation, and confidentiality, ensuring that participants' rights and welfare were protected throughout the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the level of Hybrid Work Arrangement in terms of:

**1.1 Work Flexibility;
1.2 Workload Management;
1.3 Technological Support; and
1.4 Organizational Support?**

The results in Table 1 indicate that the level of Hybrid Work Arrangement in terms of Work Flexibility is generally perceived positively by employees, with an overall mean of 3.08, interpreted as Agree. The highest mean of 3.42 was for “I feel trusted by management to complete my work regardless of location,” suggesting that employees experience a strong sense of autonomy and trust, which is consistent with research showing that perceived trust and autonomy are key predictors of employee satisfaction and engagement in hybrid work settings (Waizenegger et al., 2022). Conversely, the lowest mean of 2.67 for “My agency allows flexible scheduling” highlights that formal flexibility policies may need improvement to fully support employee needs. Studies have noted that even when autonomy is high, a lack of clear scheduling guidelines can create role ambiguity and work-life conflict in hybrid arrangements (Toscano & Zappalà, 2022). Overall, this suggests that while employees feel trusted, institutional policies on scheduling remain an area for enhancement.

Table 1
The level of Hybrid Work Arrangement in terms of Work Flexibility

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
My agency allows flexible scheduling under the hybrid work arrangement.	2.67	1.08	Agree
I am given sufficient autonomy in deciding when to work on-site or remotely.	2.79	0.96	Agree
Hybrid work enables me to manage my tasks more efficiently.	3.33	0.85	Strongly Agree
The current work arrangement respects employees' personal time.	3.18	0.81	Agree
I feel trusted by management to complete my work regardless of location.	3.42	0.71	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.08	0.88	Agree

Table 2 shows the level of Workload Management under hybrid arrangements, with an overall mean of 3.24, also interpreted as Agree. The highest means of 3.36 were observed for “Deadlines are manageable in the hybrid work system” and “Hybrid work helps distribute work responsibilities more fairly,” reflecting that employees perceive hybrid work as supporting equitable task distribution and realistic deadlines. The lowest mean of 3.09 for “I am not overburdened by tasks during remote or on-site workdays” indicates that workload balance is still a moderate concern. Research indicates that hybrid work can improve workload equity and flexibility but requires clear task allocation and proactive management to prevent overload (Waizenegger et al., 2022). This underscores the importance of monitoring workloads to maintain employee productivity and well-being in hybrid environments.

Table 2
The level of Hybrid Work Arrangement in terms of Workload Management

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
My workload is reasonable under the hybrid work setup.	3.18	0.88	Agree
Work assignments are clearly defined despite the hybrid arrangement.	3.18	0.81	Agree
I am not overburdened by tasks during remote or on-site workdays.	3.09	0.77	Agree
Deadlines are manageable in the hybrid work system.	3.36	0.70	Strongly Agree
Hybrid work helps distribute work responsibilities more fairly.	3.36	0.70	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.24	0.77	Agree

In Table 3, the level of Technological Support is assessed, with an overall mean of 3.22, interpreted as Agree. The highest mean of 3.55 for “Internet connectivity supports my work requirements” highlights that stable digital infrastructure is a critical enabler of hybrid work efficiency. In contrast, the lowest mean of 3.03 for “Technical problems are promptly addressed by the agency” suggests that IT support and troubleshooting require improvement to maintain satisfaction. Studies emphasize that access to reliable technology and responsive IT support directly influences employees’ productivity and satisfaction under hybrid arrangements (Toscano & Zappalà, 2022). Therefore, both the provision and maintenance of digital tools are essential for effective hybrid work.

Table 3
The level of Hybrid Work Arrangement in terms of Technological Support

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
My agency provides adequate digital tools for hybrid work.	3.09	0.91	Agree
Internet connectivity supports my work requirements.	3.55	0.56	Strongly Agree
I can easily access work-related systems from remote locations.	3.12	0.86	Agree
Technical problems are promptly addressed by the agency.	3.03	0.85	Agree
I am confident in using digital platforms required for hybrid work.	3.33	0.78	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.22	0.79	Agree

Table 4 presents Organizational Support, with an overall mean of 3.05, interpreted as Agree. The highest mean of 3.27 for “Supervisors provide guidance when challenges arise in hybrid work” indicates that employees value managerial support during work transitions, which aligns with findings that leadership engagement is critical to sustaining hybrid work performance and morale (Waizenegger et al., 2022). The lowest mean of 2.94 for “My agency has clear policies governing hybrid work arrangements” suggests that formal policies could be clarified or strengthened to provide consistent guidance. Research highlights that organizational support in policy clarity, communication, and responsiveness is crucial to reduce uncertainty and enhance employees’ overall quality of work life (Toscano & Zappalà, 2022).

Table 4
The level of Hybrid Work Arrangement in terms of Organizational Support

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Management demonstrates concern for employees’ well-being in hybrid work.	3.00	0.75	Agree
My agency has clear policies governing hybrid work arrangements.	2.94	0.79	Agree
Supervisors provide guidance when challenges arise in hybrid work.	3.27	0.67	Strongly Agree
Employee concerns related to hybrid work are acknowledged by management.	3.09	0.72	Agree
I feel supported by the organization in adapting to hybrid work.	2.97	0.95	Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.05	0.78	Agree

2. What is the level of Quality of Life of employees in terms of:

2.1 Work–Life Balance;

2.2 Physical Well-Being;

2.3 Psychological Well-Being; and

2.4 Social Well-Being?

Table 5 shows that employees generally agree (overall mean = 3.24) that hybrid work positively affects their Work–Life Balance. The highest mean of 3.42 for “Hybrid work allows me to spend more time with my family” suggests that flexibility in work location and schedule helps employees integrate personal and professional responsibilities more effectively. On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.06

for “Hybrid work reduces work-related stress at home” implies that hybrid arrangements do not automatically eliminate stressors associated with balancing work and home life. Research indicates that hybrid work models can significantly improve work-life balance by offering autonomy and control over scheduling, which contributes to overall well-being when supported by organizational practices (Oliveira & Costa, 2025). These results highlight the potential of hybrid work to enhance daily life quality while also underscoring the need for supportive structures to manage stress and boundaries.

Table 5
The level of Quality of Life of employees in terms of Work–Life Balance

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Hybrid work allows me to spend more time with my family.	3.42	0.79	Strongly Agree
I can balance my work and personal responsibilities effectively.	3.36	0.86	Strongly Agree
My work schedule does not interfere excessively with my personal life.	3.09	0.77	Agree
Hybrid work reduces work-related stress at home.	3.06	0.93	Agree
I have better control over my daily routine because of hybrid work.	3.27	0.80	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.24	0.83	Agree

In Table 6, the level of Physical Well Being under hybrid arrangements is also interpreted as Agree (overall mean = 3.15), indicating moderate satisfaction with physical health outcomes. The highest means of 3.24 for “I experience less physical fatigue” and “Hybrid work allows me to rest adequately” suggest that reduced commuting and greater control over work pace can lessen physical strain. Conversely, the lowest mean of 2.94 for “My work setup supports my physical health” points to ongoing challenges with home or hybrid workspace ergonomics. Studies have found that hybrid work can lead to healthier lifestyles, including increased time for exercise and rest, which improves physical well-being when employees adopt healthy routines (Forbes, 2024). Thus, while hybrid work supports reduced fatigue and better rest, tailored interventions for ergonomic support remain important.

Table 6
The level of Quality of Life of employees in terms of Physical Well-Being

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I experience less physical fatigue under hybrid work arrangements.	3.24	0.79	Agree
My work setup supports my physical health.	2.94	0.86	Agree
I have fewer health complaints related to work since hybrid work began.	3.09	0.80	Agree
Hybrid work allows me to rest adequately.	3.24	0.75	Agree
I feel physically comfortable while performing my job duties.	3.21	0.82	Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.15	0.81	Agree

Table 7 reveals that employees agree (overall mean = 3.24) that Psychological Well Being is supported by hybrid work arrangements. The highest mean of 3.36 for “I feel motivated to work” and strong agreement for mental well-being highlight that flexibility and autonomy in hybrid models can boost motivation and job satisfaction. The lowest mean of 2.97 for “I experience lower stress levels at work” suggests that not all employees uniformly experience reduced stress, indicating that psychological outcomes can be mixed. Literature on hybrid work underscores that hybrid arrangements enhance psychological well-being through work-life integration and autonomy—yet stress and emotional exhaustion may persist without adequate support and workload management (Workplace Culture of Health Study, 2025). These findings suggest that the psychological benefits of hybrid work are meaningful but may require organizational strategies to be fully realized.

Table 7
The level of Quality of Life of employees in terms of Psychological Well-Being

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I feel motivated to work under the hybrid work arrangement.	3.36	0.78	Strongly Agree
Hybrid work positively affects my job satisfaction.	3.30	0.81	Strongly Agree
I feel less emotionally exhausted since hybrid work was implemented.	3.24	0.83	Agree
I experience lower stress levels at work.	2.97	0.85	Agree
Hybrid work contributes positively to my mental well-being.	3.33	0.78	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.24	0.81	Agree

Table 8 indicates that employees generally agree (overall mean= 3.23) that hybrid work supports Social Well Being. The highest mean of 3.27 for “Social interaction at work remains meaningful” suggests that meaningful connections can be maintained even with reduced physical presence. In contrast, the lowest mean of 3.18 for “I feel a sense of belonging in my workplace” shows that some employees may still feel somewhat disconnected or less included. Research on hybrid work environments suggests that social well-being can be challenged by reduced in-person contact, requiring intentional organizational efforts to strengthen belonging and peer relationships (Marozva & Pelser, 2025). This highlights that while hybrid work may preserve some social interactions, additional strategies are needed to enhance employees’ sense of inclusion and connectedness.

Table 8
The level of Quality of Life of employees in terms of Social Well-Being

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I still feel connected with my coworkers despite hybrid work.	3.24	0.79	Agree
Team relationships remain strong under hybrid arrangements.	3.21	0.78	Agree
I feel a sense of belonging in my workplace.	3.18	0.77	Agree
Hybrid work does not isolate me from my colleagues.	3.24	0.79	Agree
Social interaction at work remains meaningful.	3.27	0.76	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.23	0.78	Agree

3. Is there a significant influence of Hybrid Work Arrangement on the Quality of Life of employees?

The results in Table 9 indicate that Workload Management under the hybrid work arrangement has a significant positive influence on employees’ Quality of Life, as evidenced by a beta coefficient of 0.610 and a p-value of 0.003, which is below the 0.05 threshold. This suggests that the way work is assigned, distributed, and monitored in hybrid systems directly affects employees’ well-being, stress levels, and overall satisfaction with work-life balance. Employees perceive balanced workloads and manageable deadlines as key contributors to their physical, psychological, and social quality of life, emphasizing the importance of effective planning and communication in hybrid environments.

In contrast, Work Flexibility, Technological Support, and Organizational Support were not found to have a statistically significant influence on employees’ Quality of Life, with p-values of 0.071, 0.873, and 0.765, respectively. While flexibility and organizational support are perceived positively in descriptive analyses, they do not independently predict variations in Quality of Life when controlling for other factors in this model. This may indicate that employees value workload management as the most tangible and impactful aspect of hybrid work affecting their daily experience.

Overall, the regression model explains a substantial portion of the variation in Quality of Life, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.630, and the ANOVA result ($p = 0.000$) confirms that the overall model is statistically significant. These findings highlight that while hybrid work arrangements offer multiple benefits,

structured workload management remains the critical factor in improving employee well-being, stress reduction, and satisfaction in a government agency context. This emphasizes the need for managers to focus on equitable task distribution, clear expectations, and reasonable deadlines to optimize the positive effects of hybrid work on employees' quality of life.

Table 9
The Test of the Significant Influence of Hybrid Work Arrangement on the Quality of Life of employees

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.148	.435		.340	.736
Work Flexibility	.390	.208	.378	1.878	.071
Workload Management	.656	.200	.610	3.278	.003
Technological Support	-.038	.238	-.034	-.161	.873
Organizational Support	-.055	.181	-.054	-.301	.765

Significant if $P\text{-value} < 0.05$

Note: Adjusted $R^2 = 0.630$

ANOVA for Regression: 14.648 $p = .000$

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study indicate that hybrid work arrangements in the Philippine government agency are generally perceived positively by employees across multiple dimensions, including work flexibility, workload management, technological support, and organizational support. Employees appreciate the autonomy and trust granted in hybrid setups, which allows them to manage tasks more efficiently and balance personal and professional responsibilities. Despite this positive perception, certain areas, such as formal scheduling policies and IT support, still require improvement to enhance the overall effectiveness of the hybrid system.

Workload management emerged as the most significant factor influencing employees' quality of life, suggesting that clear task distribution, manageable deadlines, and equitable workload allocation are critical to employee well-being. Employees reported that when responsibilities are fairly assigned and deadlines are reasonable, stress levels decrease, motivation increases, and satisfaction with both work and personal life improves. This highlights the importance of careful planning and supervision in hybrid work arrangements to maintain optimal performance and well-being.

While work flexibility, technological support, and organizational support were perceived positively, they did not show a statistically significant impact on quality of life in this study. This implies that although these factors contribute to overall satisfaction, they are not as directly influential as workload management in shaping employee experiences. Organizations must recognize that simply providing flexibility or resources is insufficient without ensuring that workloads are balanced and achievable.

The study also revealed that hybrid work arrangements support multiple dimensions of quality of life, including work-life balance, physical health, psychological well-being, and social connectedness. Employees generally agreed that hybrid work improves their daily routines, reduces fatigue, enhances mental health, and maintains meaningful social interactions. However, the results also suggest that attention must be given to areas where employees still experience challenges, such as managing stress at home and fostering a sense of belonging.

In conclusion, hybrid work arrangements can be an effective strategy for enhancing employee quality of life when implemented thoughtfully. Prioritizing workload management, maintaining clear communication, and providing adequate support systems are essential for maximizing the benefits of hybrid work. Organizations should continue to refine hybrid practices to ensure that employees can

experience optimal well-being, productivity, and engagement, ultimately contributing to more sustainable and effective work environments

REFERENCES

- Ameen, N., Binani, S., & Al-Khouri, A. (2023). Digital engagement and student expectations in higher education. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(2), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedutech.2023.03.005>
- Binani, S., Ameen, N., & Kumar, V. (2023). Understanding student decision-making in higher education: A behavioral approach. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 115, 101–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102001>
- Chatterjee, S., Nguyen, B., Ghosh, S. K., Bhattacharjee, K. K., Chaudhuri, S., & Bhattacharya, S. (2021). Social media engagement and educational choice: Evidence from millennials. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20(6), 1423–1440. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1941>
- Chemisana, D., & Leonov, M. (2023). Attitudinal determinants of student behavior: A quantitative review. *Journal of Behavioral Studies*, 18(2), 101–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2023.1956012>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., ... & Raman, R. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 102168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168>
- Fitrayanti, I., & Purwanto, A. (2020). Personal and social factors affecting student aspirations in higher education (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Harrigan, P., Evers, U., Miles, M., & Daly, T. (2020). Customer engagement with social media: A framework for higher education. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 30(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2019.1652045>
- Hollebeek, L. D., Clark, M. K., & Macky, K. (2021). Digital and social media engagement in student learning behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 135, 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.034>
- Jung, S., Claire, S., & Kim, H. (2024). Cross-cultural student engagement and social media influence on educational expectations. *Higher Education Studies*, 14(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v14n1p55>
- Li, X., & Xie, H. (2020). Cultural influences on students' higher education expectations: Evidence from Asia. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(4), 567–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-020-09611-8>
- Lin, L., Chen, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Platform trust and social media in higher education choice. *Computers & Education*, 180, 104432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104432>
- Luo, N., Sun, Y., & Wang, J. (2022). Student perceptions and digital engagement: The role of social media in shaping expectations. *Educational Media International*, 59(3), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2022.2101143>
- Minchekar, R. (2022). Psychological factors in consumer behavior: Applications in student choice. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(5), 876–888. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12785>

- Musa, M., & Hasan, R. (2024). Program-related influences on student decision-making in private universities (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- NEDA. (2021). *Philippine higher education affordability report*. National Economic and Development Authority. <https://www.neda.gov.ph>
- Nguyen, T. T., Pham, L. H., & Tran, Q. (2021). Economic determinants of higher education enrollment in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 14(2), 182–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2020.1864958>
- Perna, L. W. (2020). Understanding the student choice process in higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720942904>
- Por, K., Say, H., & Mov, S. (2024). Gender differences in student expectations for higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(2), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2023-0500>
- Salam, S., Jabeen, F., & Malik, R. (2024). Multi-dimensional student expectations in private universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2212045>
- Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2007). *Consumer behavior* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Shaw, R. (2024). Personal factors influencing student choice in higher education. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 61(1), 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2023.2165874>
- Šostar, Ž., & Ristanović, D. (2023). Household resources and educational expectations in higher education (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Zagreb, Croatia.
- Sun, H., Chen, Z., & Wu, T. (2020). Digital influence on prospective students' educational expectations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 106, 106228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.106228>
- Thangavel, S., Sundaram, P., & Joseph, T. (2019). Understanding student expectations in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 70, 102–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2019.02.002>
- Tomlinson, M., Zhang, Y., & Batar, W. V. T. (2023). Student expectations and career readiness. In R. Shaw & P. Lim (Eds.), *Handbook of higher education and student development* (pp. 221–240). Routledge.
- Wu, C., Zhang, Y., & Ma, R. (2020). Psychological and social factors affecting student decision-making in higher education. *Educational Psychology*, 40(6), 721–737. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1709282>
- Zhang, L., Wu, T., & Sun, H. (2017). Social media engagement in education. In J. Davis (Ed.), *Digital learning in higher education* (pp. 95–114). Springer.
- Zwier, S., Burgers, C., & Van den Berg, P. (2022). Social influences on student enrollment intentions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(5), 1123–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1925852>