IJGGSD
ISSN: 3155-7716
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.44

Workplace Environment Conditions and Administrative Productivity Indicators in the DepEd Schools Division Office of Bislig City: A Quantitative Descriptive Comparative Survey Design as Basis for an Enhancement Program

Christianssen D. Trujillo[1], Anrey G. Antiquina, PhD[2]

[1]Master of Arts in Education, Major in Administration and Supervision, Andres Soriano Colleges of Bislig, Inc., Bislig City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

[2]School President, Andres Soriano Colleges of Bislig, Inc., Bislig City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

Email: anreyme@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study assessed workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators among personnel of the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent at the Department of Education Schools Division Office of Bislig City to inform a workplace enhancement program. Using a quantitative descriptive-comparative, cross-sectional survey and total enumeration, data from 36 consenting personnel were collected through researcher-developed workplace environment (30 items) and productivity (18 items) questionnaires. Descriptive statistics, Kruskal–Wallis tests, and Holm-adjusted pairwise comparisons were applied. Respondents reported very high involvement (M = 4.93) and supervisor support (M = 4.90), alongside very high work pressure (M = 4.76); physical comfort was the lowest-rated dimension (M = 3.44), particularly workstation suitability (M = 2.69). Task performance (M = 4.74) and contextual performance (M = 4.71) were consistently favorable, while counterproductive work behavior was rarely reported (M = 1.08). Training exposure significantly differentiated nine workplace dimensions and both task performance (p = .007) and contextual performance (p = .001), without establishing causation. Overall, strong self-reported productivity coexisted with substantial workload demands and less favorable physical working conditions. The proposed program prioritizes ergonomic improvements, workload management, equitable training, and documentation quality. Findings are limited by a single-office sample, small subgroups, and self-reported cross-sectional data. By identifying actionable administrative priorities, the study supports employee well-being, decent work, quality education, and effective public institutions, contributing to institutional and educational sustainability in alignment with Sustainable Development Goals 3, 4, 8, and 16.

Keywords: *Administrative Productivity, Employee Training, Physical Comfort, Schools Division Office, Work Pressure, Workplace Environment*

1. INTRODUCTION

Workplace environment conditions are essential to administrative efficiency, employee well-being, and institutional service delivery. Supportive supervision, collegial relationships, clear work procedures, manageable workloads, employee autonomy, and adequate physical resources contribute to the effective functioning of organizations. Conversely, unfavorable working conditions may create psychosocial risks and compromise employee performance (World Health Organization [WHO], 2022). At the regional level, productivity remains a major concern in promoting sustainable institutional and economic development (Nomura & Ho, 2025). In the Philippine basic education system, administrative efficiency has become increasingly important as the Department of Education (DepEd) implements reforms intended to reduce teachers' administrative responsibilities. DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024 directs the redistribution of administrative tasks to appropriate non-teaching personnel and school administrators (Department of Education [DepEd], 2024). However, persistent workload and staffing challenges underscore the need to strengthen administrative support systems (Second Congressional Commission on Education [EDCOM II], 2025). Against this background, the present study assesses workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators among personnel of the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent (OSDS) in the DepEd Schools Division Office of Bislig City. Using a quantitative descriptive-comparative approach, the study examines workplace conditions, productivity-related behaviors, and differences across employee profiles to develop an evidence-based workplace enhancement program.

Research Problem

Workplace conditions influence how employees experience organizational demands and perform their responsibilities. Recent Philippine research has emphasized the relevance of leadership, workplace support, and organizational conditions to employee performance in public institutions (Grantoza, 2025). Similarly, Villena and Diamante (2025) reported significant differences in workplace environment assessments among academic and non-academic personnel, highlighting variations in employee experiences across institutional roles. Valencia (2025) also identified a significant positive relationship between the physical workplace environment and employee productivity in a Philippine local government unit. Within basic education governance, administrative personnel perform essential functions involving records management, procurement, personnel administration, financial transactions, documentation, and coordination. Although national policies address administrative workload distribution, local evidence remains necessary to establish how personnel experience workplace conditions and assess their work performance (DepEd, 2024; EDCOM II, 2025). The research problem therefore concerns the need for an office-specific assessment of workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators within the OSDS of Bislig City. In particular, the study seeks to identify the relative strengths and improvement needs of different workplace dimensions and determine whether assessments vary significantly according to employee characteristics. The resulting evidence will guide the formulation of an enhancement program responsive to the administrative office's identified needs.

Assumptions of the Study

The study assumes that workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators can be assessed through employees' reported experiences and work-related behaviors. Workplace conditions are understood as multidimensional, encompassing both job demands and organizational resources that may vary across employees and administrative units (Bakker et al., 2023). It further assumes that personnel with different office assignments, positions, lengths of service, work responsibilities, and training backgrounds may report different workplace experiences and productivity patterns. This assumption is consistent with evidence

that the performance-related value of workplace resources, such as autonomy, can depend on employees' organizational circumstances (Sørlie et al., 2022). The study also assumes that respondents can provide sufficiently accurate and candid information through a structured questionnaire. These assumptions provide a basis for descriptive assessment and group comparison without presupposing significant differences or causal relationships.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored in Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory, which explains how job demands and organizational resources influence employee functioning. Bakker et al. (2023) emphasized that excessive workloads may increase occupational strain, while adequate resources can strengthen employee engagement and performance. In this study, work pressure represents a job demand, whereas supervisory support, peer cohesion, autonomy, role clarity, and physical comfort serve as organizational resources. Complementing this perspective, Person–Organization Fit highlights the importance of compatibility between employees and their workplace, particularly in strengthening the benefits of autonomy (Sørlie et al., 2022). Similarly, Social Exchange Theory explains how perceived organizational support encourages positive workplace behaviors and engagement (Park & Kim, 2024). Furthermore, role clarity and supportive working conditions contribute to effective performance and innovation (Asamani et al., 2025; Chaiyapruksayanonde & Ponchaitiwat, 2025). Administrative productivity is also examined through the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ) framework, comprising task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior (Lousã et al., 2024). Collectively, these perspectives guide the assessment of workplace conditions and productivity indicators across employee profiles, providing a basis for a proposed workplace enhancement program without establishing causal relationships.

Moreover, the study aligns with SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), SDG 4 (Quality Education), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), which emphasize employee welfare, educational support, productive employment, and institutional effectiveness (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs [UN DESA], 2025). Specifically, examining work pressure, organizational support, and physical comfort supports SDG 3 by identifying conditions relevant to occupational well-being (WHO, 2022). Meanwhile, assessing administrative productivity contributes to SDG 4 by informing improvements in educational support services, consistent with DepEd's administrative reforms (DepEd, 2024). The study also supports SDG 8 by identifying opportunities to improve working conditions and employee productivity, while its emphasis on role clarity, accountability, and operational efficiency aligns with SDG 16. Overall, the proposed workplace enhancement program provides an evidence-based foundation for institutional, socio-economic, and educational sustainability, subject to future implementation and evaluation.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a quantitative descriptive-comparative survey design to examine workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators without manipulating existing organizational circumstances (Slater & Hasson, 2025). Specifically, the descriptive component assessed the levels of workplace conditions and productivity-related behaviors, while the comparative component determined whether significant differences existed when respondents were grouped according to office assignment, position, years in service, nature of work, and relevant training attended. This approach was consistent with nonexperimental research involving naturally occurring groups (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). Accordingly, the design provided an empirical basis for identifying organizational improvement priorities and developing

a targeted workplace enhancement program rather than establishing causal relationships (Twombly, 2024).

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted at the Department of Education Schools Division Office of Bislig City, located in Surigao del Sur, Caraga Region, Philippines. Specifically, it covered personnel assigned to the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent (OSDS), including the Personnel, General Service, Supply, Cashier, Records, Procurement, Administrative, Budget, and Finance Units. These offices perform essential administrative and operational support functions, making them appropriate settings for assessing workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators.

Participants or Data Sources

The study employed total enumeration, wherein all eligible and accessible personnel within the covered administrative units were invited to participate. A total of 36 personnel who provided informed consent and complete questionnaire responses were included in the final analysis. Eligibility required official assignment to the covered units during the data-collection period, voluntary participation, and sufficiently complete responses for scoring. Conversely, personnel who declined consent, were unavailable during data collection, or submitted unusable questionnaires were excluded. Respondents were characterized according to office or unit assignment, position or designation, years in service, primary nature of work, and relevant training attended. To maintain confidentiality, individual responses were identified using respondent codes rather than personal names.

Research Instruments or Materials

The study utilized a researcher-administered questionnaire comprising three sections: respondents' profiles, workplace environment conditions, and administrative productivity indicators. The profile section gathered information on office assignment, position, years in service, nature of work, and relevant training attended during the preceding two years. Workplace conditions were assessed using a researcher-developed 30-item instrument aligned with the Work Environment Scale framework, covering ten dimensions: involvement, peer cohesion, supervisor support, autonomy, task orientation, work pressure, clarity, control, innovation, and physical comfort (El Achi et al., 2025). Responses followed a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), with higher work pressure scores indicating greater perceived demands. Meanwhile, administrative productivity was measured through an 18-item instrument aligned with the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ), assessing task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior using six items per dimension (Lousã et al., 2024). A five-point frequency scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always) assessed behaviors during the preceding four weeks, with higher counterproductive work behavior scores indicating greater behavioral risks. Before administration, the questionnaire was reviewed and refined for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives, while internal consistency was considered separately (Madadizadeh & Bahariniya, 2025).

Data Gathering Procedure

Before data collection, the researcher secured permission from the concerned authorities of the DepEd Schools Division Office of Bislig City and coordinated the administration schedule to minimize disruption to regular office operations. Subsequently, the finalized questionnaire was distributed through a researcher-guided paper-and-pencil procedure, with uniform instructions provided to all participants. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose, voluntary participation, and confidentiality safeguards before providing informed consent. Questionnaire

completion required approximately 10 to 15 minutes. After retrieval, the accomplished questionnaires were checked for completeness and encoded into the OSDS Automatic Scoring Tool. The final dataset comprised 36 consented respondents with complete workplace environment and administrative productivity responses. The encoded data were then verified, organized, and processed to generate dimension means, interpretation labels, respondent profiles, and descriptive summaries for subsequent analysis.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequencies and percentages described respondents' profiles, while means, standard deviations, and rankings assessed workplace environment conditions and administrative productivity indicators. Scores were interpreted using predetermined five-point scales, with work pressure and counterproductive work behavior evaluated separately because higher ratings indicated greater demands and behavioral risks. A supplementary productivity index was computed by reverse-scoring counterproductive work behavior and averaging it with task and contextual performance. Furthermore, group differences were examined using appropriate parametric or nonparametric tests based on data distribution and sample size. Kruskal–Wallis tests and Holm-adjusted pairwise comparisons were applied when appropriate, with statistical significance set at 0.05. Finally, the findings were synthesized to identify workplace concerns, productivity gaps, and improvement priorities that informed the proposed workplace enhancement program.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical principles were observed throughout the research process. Necessary institutional permission was obtained before data collection, and participation was voluntary and subject to informed consent. Respondents were informed of the study's objectives, confidentiality measures, and their freedom to decline participation. To protect their identities, participants were instructed not to indicate their names, and respondent codes were used during data encoding. Moreover, only consented responses were included in the analysis, and findings were reported in aggregate form to prevent individual identification. The collected information was used exclusively for research purposes and was not intended for personnel evaluation or administrative action.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

3.1.1 Office Assignment, Position, and Nature of Work

The respondents represented ten administrative units, with the General Service Unit comprising the largest proportion (33.33%), followed by the Personnel Unit (22.22%) and Supply Unit (11.11%). In terms of position, Administrative Assistant III was the most common designation (25.00%). Regarding primary work assignments, General Services accounted for 33.33%, followed by Human Resource and Administrative Support (25.00%), other functions (16.67%), Property and Asset Management (11.11%), Records and Archives (8.33%), and Procurement (5.56%). These findings indicate that the respondents performed diverse administrative and operational functions requiring different levels of coordination, physical resources, and technical competencies. However, the unequal distribution of personnel across units necessitates caution when interpreting group differences. From a public administration perspective, workforce capabilities and efficient resource management are essential considerations in strengthening institutional performance (OECD, 2025).

3.1.2 Years in Service and Training Exposure

Respondents had an average of 6.67 years in service (SD = 5.41), with 41.67% having served for one to five years, another 41.67% for six to ten years, and 16.67% for eleven years or more. Regarding training exposure, 61.11% had attended four to five relevant training areas, while 19.44% had attended one to three and another 19.44% reported none. Data Privacy and Customer Service were the most frequently attended trainings (75.00% each), followed by Records Management (63.89%), ICT/Digital Systems (61.11%), and Procurement (30.56%). The findings demonstrate considerable variation in employees' professional development exposure despite substantial overall participation. In particular, the absence of relevant training among seven respondents highlights the importance of examining equitable access to capacity-building opportunities. This consideration is supported by Deutscher and Braunstein (2023), who emphasized the multidimensional nature of workplace learning environments and the importance of assessing conditions that support employee learning.

3.2 Workplace Environment Conditions

3.2.1 Organizational Support and Workplace Climate

The results revealed very high ratings across most favorable workplace environment dimensions. Involvement obtained the highest mean (M = 4.93, SD = 0.28), followed by Supervisor Support (M = 4.90, SD = 0.29), Peer Cohesion and Innovation (M = 4.89 each), Control (M = 4.87), Autonomy (M = 4.85), Clarity (M = 4.82), and Task Orientation (M = 4.81). At the item level, personal involvement in achieving unit targets received the highest rating (M = 4.94). The supplementary overall workplace environment mean was 4.72 (SD = 0.29), although this included the unreversed work pressure dimension. These findings suggest that employees generally perceived strong organizational participation, collegial cooperation, supervisory guidance, procedural consistency, and openness to innovation. Comparable findings in the literature identify supportive supervision, coworker relationships, and participatory organizational practices as important workplace resources associated with employee engagement and performance (Kwon & Kim, 2025; Milaad et al., 2025; Villena & Diamante, 2025; Yücel & Bayat, 2025). Similarly, the Office of the U.S. Surgeon General (2022) emphasized the importance of workplace connection, employee participation, and organizational support in promoting worker well-being.

3.2.2 Work Pressure and Occupational Demands

Despite favorable organizational assessments, Work Pressure obtained a Very High rating (M = 4.76, SD = 0.36). Specifically, respondents reported frequently working at a rapid pace (M = 4.86), experiencing insufficient recovery time (M = 4.81), and encountering urgent requests that disrupted planned tasks (M = 4.61). These results indicate considerable workload demands despite the generally supportive workplace environment. This finding illustrates the coexistence of substantial job demands and strong organizational resources. According to Job Demands–Resources Theory, supportive conditions may facilitate work functioning, but persistent demands can still contribute to occupational strain (Bakker et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2024; Yücel & Bayat, 2025). Furthermore, the World Health Organization (2022) and International Labour Organization and World Health Organization (2022) emphasized the importance of organizational interventions in managing psychosocial workplace risks. Consequently, the findings support the need to examine workload distribution, urgent-task management, and recovery opportunities without assuming that favorable workplace relationships eliminate the effects of excessive work pressure.

3.2.3 Physical Comfort and Workplace Resources

Physical Comfort received the lowest workplace environment rating (M = 3.44, SD = 0.81), although it remained within the High category. More specifically, workstation comfort and suitability received a Moderate rating (M = 2.69, SD = 0.98), while lighting, ventilation, and noise

conditions obtained a High rating (M = 3.69, SD = 0.98). Equipment and ICT resource adequacy similarly received a High rating (M = 3.94, SD = 1.04). These findings identify physical workspace conditions, particularly workstation suitability, as the most prominent resource-related concern in the surveyed office. Previous studies have linked physical workplace conditions with employee productivity, work processes, and organizational functioning (Balancio-Canlas, 2026; Oyedeji et al., 2025; Villena & Diamante, 2025). Moreover, Skamagki et al. (2026) found that workplace interventions incorporating ergonomic strategies can improve employee health outcomes, although their evidence concerning productivity outcomes was limited and inconsistent. Accordingly, improvements in workstation design, physical facilities, and functional equipment represent reasonable institutional priorities, without presuming that such improvements would automatically increase productivity.

3.3 Administrative Productivity Indicators

3.3.1 Task and Contextual Performance

Administrative productivity assessments showed consistently favorable results. Task Performance obtained a mean of 4.74 (SD = 0.39), while Contextual Performance recorded a mean of 4.71 (SD = 0.37), both interpreted as Always. Effective task planning and prioritization received the highest task performance rating (M = 4.83), followed by efficiency in handling multiple transactions (M = 4.78). Maintaining accurate documentation obtained the lowest task performance rating (M = 4.64). Meanwhile, respectful communication with clients and coworkers ranked highest in contextual performance (M = 4.83), while suggesting practical workflow improvements received the lowest rating (M = 4.47). The supplementary administrative productivity index was also Very High (M = 4.79, SD = 0.28). These findings indicate that respondents consistently reported performing assigned responsibilities efficiently while demonstrating cooperative and constructive workplace behaviors. The results align with the multidimensional Individual Work Performance Questionnaire framework validated by Lousã et al. (2024), which distinguishes task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Nevertheless, the comparatively lower ratings for documentation accuracy and improvement suggestions identify opportunities for continuous quality enhancement. Within public institutions, strengthening administrative procedures and opportunities for improvement is consistent with the broader emphasis on organizational effectiveness and responsive service delivery (OECD, 2025).

3.3.2 Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive Work Behavior obtained a mean of 1.08 (SD = 0.19), interpreted as Never or Very Low Risk. Among the indicators, leaving tasks unfinished without valid reason recorded the highest mean (M = 1.14), while disrespectful treatment of clients or colleagues received the lowest possible mean (M = 1.00, SD = 0.00). All six indicators remained within the Very Low Risk category. The findings reflect consistently low self-reported frequencies of behaviors that could undermine workplace functioning. This pattern complements the favorable task and contextual performance assessments and supports the distinction among positive and negative work behaviors recognized in the IWPQ framework (Lousã et al., 2024). However, the results require cautious interpretation because self-reported assessments of undesirable behaviors may be influenced by social desirability or concerns about disclosure. Therefore, the findings describe perceived behavioral frequencies rather than independently verified employee conduct.

3.4 Significant Differences in Workplace Environment Conditions

3.4.1 Differences According to Position, Years in Service, and Nature of Work

The Kruskal–Wallis results showed no significant differences in workplace environment conditions across years-in-service groups (all $p > .05$). However, position classification produced a significant omnibus difference in Autonomy, $H(2) = 6.32$, $p = .042$. Administrative Assistant/Aide

personnel reported the highest autonomy mean (M = 4.90), followed by Administrative Officers (M = 4.86) and COS/Utility personnel (M = 4.67). Similarly, Physical Comfort differed significantly across categories of work, H(5) = 12.11, p = .033, with Property/Asset personnel reporting the highest mean (M = 4.50) and Records/Archives personnel the lowest (M = 2.67). Nevertheless, no individual pairwise comparison remained significant after Holm adjustment. Office/unit assignment was excluded from inferential comparisons because several categories had insufficient subgroup sizes. These findings suggest that years of service did not meaningfully differentiate workplace assessments in this dataset, while certain variations were observed across positions and work functions. This is consistent with Godfroid et al. (2022), who demonstrated that the relationship between employee tenure and performance may differ according to the outcomes examined. Similarly, Sørlie et al. (2022) emphasized that the relevance of autonomy to work performance depends partly on organizational circumstances. Nevertheless, the absence of significant adjusted pairwise comparisons indicates that specific position or functional groups cannot be conclusively identified as statistically different, supporting cautious and context-sensitive interpretation.

3.4.2 Differences According to Relevant Training Exposure

Training exposure produced significant differences in nine of the ten workplace environment dimensions, specifically Involvement, Peer Cohesion, Supervisor Support, Autonomy, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Clarity, Control, and Innovation (all $p < .05$). Physical Comfort was the only dimension without a significant training-related difference ($p = .129$). The strongest omnibus differences included Control, $H(2) = 19.46$, $p < .001$; Autonomy, $H(2) = 18.56$, $p < .001$; and Task Orientation, $H(2) = 16.01$, $p < .001$. Respondents with four to five relevant trainings generally reported higher favorable workplace assessments than those without training. However, they also reported significantly higher Work Pressure, with an adjusted p-value of .010 for the comparison between these two groups. These findings identify training exposure as the most consistent differentiating respondent characteristic in the workplace environment assessments. The pattern is compatible with Philippine evidence associating employee training and development with organizational effectiveness (Tabasa et al., 2025). Furthermore, Deutscher and Braunstein (2023) emphasized the importance of workplace learning conditions, while Kim et al. (2026) reported a positive overall association between organizational-level training and organizational performance in their meta-analysis. However, the present findings do not establish that training produced more favorable workplace experiences or higher pressure. Differences in employee responsibilities, organizational roles, or training opportunities may also contribute to the observed pattern.

3.5 Significant Differences in Administrative Productivity Indicators

3.5.1 Differences Across Position, Service Length, and Work Function

Administrative productivity indicators did not differ significantly according to position classification, years in service, or primary nature of work (all $p > .05$). Similarly, Counterproductive Work Behavior did not differ significantly across training-exposure groups, $H(2) = 2.86$, $p = .239$. These results indicate that the favorable self-reported productivity profile was generally consistent across the employee classifications examined. The absence of significant group differences suggests that the measured task-related and cooperative behaviors were not confined to particular job classifications or tenure groups. Nevertheless, nonsignificant findings should not be interpreted as proof that the groups were equivalent, particularly given the relatively small sample and unequal subgroup sizes. Previous research also indicates that tenure-related performance patterns may depend on the characteristics of the organization and the type of performance assessed (Godfroid et al., 2022).

3.5.2 Differences According to Training Exposure

Significant differences were observed across training-exposure groups for Task Performance, $H(2) = 9.99$, $p = .007$, and Contextual Performance, $H(2) = 13.14$, $p = .001$. Respondents with four to five relevant trainings recorded the highest mean ratings for Task Performance ($M = 4.89$) and Contextual Performance ($M = 4.88$), compared with those who attended one to three trainings ($M = 4.60$ and $M = 4.50$, respectively) and those without relevant training ($M = 4.40$ for both dimensions). Post hoc comparisons confirmed significantly higher Task Performance among respondents with four to five trainings than those with one to three trainings (adjusted $p = .023$) and no training (adjusted $p = .022$). Contextual Performance was also significantly higher among those with four to five trainings than those without training (adjusted $p = .002$). These findings demonstrate that greater reported training exposure was associated with higher task and contextual performance assessments within the study sample. This pattern is consistent with Tabasa et al. (2025), who examined the relevance of training and development to organizational effectiveness, and Kim et al. (2026), whose meta-analysis identified a positive association between organizational-level training and organizational performance. Nevertheless, the descriptive-comparative design prevents causal conclusions regarding the effectiveness of training. Rather, the results provide an empirical basis for prioritizing equitable professional development opportunities, particularly among personnel with limited or no relevant training exposure.

3.6 Proposed Workplace Enhancement Program

3.6.1 Priority Areas and Improvement Strategies

Based on the consolidated findings, the proposed Workplace Enhancement Program identified several priority areas: workstation and physical comfort improvement, work pressure and workflow management, equitable training and capacity-building, role-sensitive autonomy and supervisory support, employee participation in continuous improvement, documentation quality assurance, and organizational monitoring. The proposed strategies include ergonomic and resource assessments, improved workload prioritization, expanded role-relevant training, clarification of decision-making responsibilities, structured employee suggestion mechanisms, standardized documentation procedures, and follow-up workplace assessments within six to twelve months. The program was formulated from the observed workplace conditions and productivity patterns but was not implemented or evaluated within the study. The proposed program represents a targeted organizational improvement approach rather than a general remedial intervention. In particular, its priorities reflect the need to address physical-resource deficiencies and excessive work demands while preserving existing organizational strengths. This direction is consistent with international recommendations for preventive workplace interventions and employee well-being (World Health Organization, 2022; International Labour Organization & World Health Organization, 2022). Furthermore, the Office of the U.S. Surgeon General (2022) emphasizes worker participation, supportive relationships, and equitable development opportunities as components of workplace well-being. From an institutional perspective, the emphasis on employee capabilities, effective procedures, and resource management also corresponds with contemporary public-sector improvement priorities (OECD, 2025). Accordingly, the proposed program provides an evidence-informed framework for strengthening administrative operations within the DepEd Schools Division Office of Bislig City, subject to subsequent implementation and evaluation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings indicate that the 36 participating personnel of the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent in the DepEd Schools Division Office of Bislig City perceived a strongly supportive organizational environment, characterized by high involvement, peer cohesion, supervisory support, role clarity, autonomy, and openness to innovation. Nevertheless, very high work

pressure and comparatively weak physical comfort, particularly workstation suitability, revealed important conditions requiring improvement. Personnel also reported consistently high task and contextual performance and very low counterproductive work behavior, suggesting that favorable self-reported productivity coexisted with substantial workplace demands. Years in service did not significantly differentiate the assessed indicators, while position-related autonomy and work-function differences in physical comfort did not yield significant adjusted pairwise comparisons. Training exposure was the clearest differentiating characteristic, with greater exposure generally accompanying more favorable workplace assessments and higher task and contextual performance, alongside greater work pressure. Overall, the study supports a targeted workplace enhancement program rather than broad productivity remediation.

The Schools Division Superintendent and OSDS management should use the proposed Workplace Enhancement Program to prioritize physical comfort and workload management while maintaining strong teamwork, supervisory support, clarity, and employee participation. Administrative, Supply/Property, General Services, and ICT personnel should undertake a unit-level ergonomic and resource audit, then phase improvements in workstation suitability, equipment, lighting, ventilation, and space according to documented needs. Unit heads should review workload distribution, establish priorities for urgent requests, set realistic turnaround expectations, limit avoidable interruptions, and protect reasonable recovery periods. The Personnel/HR function should establish an equitable, role-relevant training plan, prioritizing personnel without recorded training and including peer knowledge-sharing and follow-up assessment. Supervisors should clarify decision authority, particularly for COS/Utility personnel, and strengthen employee suggestion channels, standardized documentation checklists, and quality reviews. Finally, management should reassess workplace conditions and productivity within six to twelve months, using confidential aggregate findings to refine interventions rather than evaluate individual employees.

The findings are confined to 36 consenting personnel within the covered OSDS units of one Schools Division Office and should not be generalized to other offices or DepEd personnel. Small, uneven subgroups limited statistical comparisons; office assignment could not be tested inferentially, and significant omnibus findings for autonomy and physical comfort did not produce significant adjusted pairwise differences. Because the study used a cross-sectional, descriptive-comparative design, it cannot establish causal relationships or capture changes across workload cycles. Self-reported responses may reflect perception or social desirability bias. The proposed enhancement program was not implemented or evaluated; broader, longitudinal studies incorporating independent service indicators could address these limitations.

5. REFERENCES

Asamani, L., Acquah-Coleman, R., Senayah, W. K., & Oppong, S. (2025). Interactive roles of resource availability, role clarity and employee motivation in enhancing organisational effectiveness through employee performance and job satisfaction. *Discover Psychology, 5*, Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-025-00333-8

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 25–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933

Balancio-Canlas, A. M. T. (2026). The relationship of physical work environment on employee productivity of call center agents: Inputs to an enhanced productivity programs and strategies. *Philippine Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 1*(2), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.67730/6b501f65

Chaiyapruksayanonde, C., & Ponchaitiwat, K. (2025). Supportive work environments, innovative work behavior, and job performance in the hospitality industry: Empirical evidence from Thailand. *Tourism and Hospitality, 6*(1), Article 20. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6010020

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://us2.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book270550

Department of Education. (2024). *Immediate removal of administrative tasks of public school teachers (DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_002.pdf

Deutscher, V., & Braunstein, A. (2023). Measuring the quality of workplace learning environments—A qualitative meta synthesis of employee questionnaires. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 35*(9), 134–161. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-06-2022-0074

El Achi, S., Jabbour Al Maalouf, N., Barakat, H., & Mawad, J. L. (2025). The impact of transformational leadership and work environment on teachers' performance in crisis-affected educational settings. *Administrative Sciences, 15*(7), Article 256. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15070256

Godfroid, C., Otiti, N., & Mersland, R. (2022). Employee tenure and staff performance: The case of a social enterprise. *Journal of Business Research, 139*, 457–467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.10.011

Grantoza, S. A. (2025). Effects of leadership style, work environment, and organizational motivation on employee performance moderated by job satisfaction: A case of local government unit of San Pascual, Batangas. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*(6), 6164–6192. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000474

Guo, L., Jia, S., Niu, X., & Wang, Z. (2024). One who wishes to wear the crown, must bear its weight: How performance pressure benefits career-prospective employees in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 155*, Article 104056. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2024.104056

International Labour Organization, & World Health Organization. (2022). *Mental health at work: Policy brief*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240057944

Kim, J., Chang, H., & Bell, B. S. (2026). Organizational-level training and performance: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Management, 52*(5), 1772–1809. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063251327588

Kwon, S.-H., & Kim, J.-S. (2025). Relationship between participative decision-making within an organization and employees' cognitive flexibility, creativity, and voice behavior. *Behavioral Sciences, 15*(1), Article 51. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15010051

Lousã, E. P., Alves, M. P., & Koopmans, L. (2024). Adaptation and validation of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire into a Portuguese version. *Administrative Sciences, 14*(7), Article 150. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14070150

Madadizadeh, F., & Bahariniya, S. (2025). Tutorial on internal consistency assessment by Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega. *Perioperative Care and Operating Room Management, 41*, Article 100568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcorm.2025.100568

Milaad, S. A. M., Atan, T., & Yeşiltaş, M. (2025). Assessing the impact of perceived supervisory support on service recovery performance: The role of work engagement and emotional stability among Libyan air traffic controllers. *Sustainability, 17*(5), Article 2284. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052284

Nomura, K., & Ho, M. S. (2025). *APO productivity databook 2025*. Asian Productivity Organization. https://doi.org/10.61145/GENB1427

Office of the U.S. Surgeon General. (2022). *The U.S. Surgeon General's framework for workplace mental health & well-being*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/workplace-mental-health-well-being.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). *Government at a glance 2025*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/0efd0bcd-en

Oyedeji, B. A., Ko, Y. H., & Lee, S. (2025). Physical work environments: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management, 51*(6), 2589–2626. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063251315703

Park, J., & Kim, J. (2024). The relationship between perceived organizational support, work engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and customer orientation in the public sports organizations context. *Behavioral Sciences, 14*(3), Article 153. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14030153

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2025). *Removing the burden of administration from teachers* [Policy brief]. https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2025/03/EDCOM2_Policy_Brief_Removing_the_Burden_of_Administration_from_Teachers.pdf

Skamagki, G., Greaves, C. J., Shrestha, R. M., & Stathi, A. (2026). Workplace interventions for chronic musculoskeletal disorders: A systematic review. *BMJ Open, 16*(6), Article e115276. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2025-115276

Slater, P., & Hasson, F. (2025). Quantitative research designs, hierarchy of evidence and validity. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 32*(3), 656–660. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.13135

Sørlie, H. O., Hetland, J., Bakker, A. B., Espevik, R., & Olsen, O. K. (2022). Daily autonomy and job performance: Does person–organization fit act as a key resource? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 133*, Article 103691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103691

Tabasa, C. S., Polinar, M. A. N., Delantar, A. F. A., Delantar, A. B., & Ouano, C. L. (2025). Training and development in employee retention and organizational effectiveness at a manufacturing firm in Naga City, Cebu, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 6*(6), 2766–2777. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.06.09

Twombly, S. (2024). *Assessment and evaluation in higher education: A practical guide*. University of Kansas. https://opentext.ku.edu/assessmentevaluationhighered/

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2025). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2025*. United Nations. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2025/

Valencia, A. P. O. (2025). The impact of workplace environment on employee productivity and employee health in the local government unit of Santa Rita, Pampanga. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3*(12), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.701

Villena, J. B., & Diamante, V. E. (2025). Work environment and employee productivity in selected higher education institutions of Manila. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 12*(11), 844–858. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12110077

World Health Organization. (2022). *WHO guidelines on mental health at work*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052

Yücel, İ., & Bayat, F. (2025). The mediating role of co-worker support in the relationship between occupational stress and employee performance: A study of airports. *Ekonomski Vjesnik/Econviews – Review of Contemporary Business, Entrepreneurship and Economic Issues, 38*(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.51680/ev.38.1.5