



American Journal of Arts and Human Science (AJAHS)

ISSN: 2832-451X (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 2 (2025)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Work Environment and Job Performance among Non-Teaching Employees of Higher Education Institutions in Region 10

Marymae D. Suminguit¹*, Ninfa C. Osias¹, Gerlinda G. Corpuz¹, Rizhaly B. Maandig¹, Mary Jean P. Castro¹

Article Information

Received: February 17, 2025

Accepted: March 19, 2025

Published: May 19, 2025

Keywords

Compensation, Employees, Job Performance, Leadership, Work Environment

ABSTRACT

This study explores the connection between the work environment and job performance of non-teaching employees in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Region 10. It focuses on employees such as Academic Secretaries, Librarians, Registrar Staff, and Student Affairs personnel, who play essential roles in institutional operations. Using a mixed-method approach, qualitative and quantitative data were collected from 300 respondents through surveys and interviews. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure diverse experiences and key roles were represented. A structured questionnaire measured demographics, work environment perceptions, and job performance indicators, including productivity, people skills, and attendance. The study aimed to determine the levels of work environment satisfaction and job performance among non-teaching employees. It sought to describe the demographic and professional profiles of respondents, assess their perceptions of the work environment, and evaluate perceived job performance. It also examined significant differences in job performance based on demographic and professional characteristics and analyzed the relationship between work environment assessments and job performance. Descriptive statistics were used, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Pearson's *r*, F-test, and T-test determined significant relationships and differences in job performance. Results showed that a positive work environment significantly improves job performance. Factors such as clear role expectations, fair compensation, leadership style, and professional growth opportunities were critical. Interviews emphasized the need for employee recognition and career development. The study concludes that improving workplace conditions benefits both employees and institutions. HEIs are recommended to implement the Work Enhancement Plan, including flexible work arrangements to reduce absenteeism.

INTRODUCTION

Non-teaching employees played an important role in universities and colleges by ensuring smooth daily operations, supporting teachers and students, and maintaining a positive learning environment. However, their contributions were often overlooked. This study examined the factors that affected their job performance in universities and colleges in Region 10, focusing on job type, salary, work environment, relationships with coworkers, and leadership styles to find ways to improve their working conditions.

The quality of support services from non-teaching staff was essential in schools. These employees helped students' access services and assisted teachers in their tasks, directly influencing the overall learning experience. A positive work environment and good relationships with coworkers improved motivation, while poor leadership and low salaries led to dissatisfaction and lower productivity. Understanding these factors helped schools create better support systems for their employees.

This study gathered data from 300 non-teaching employees in schools accredited by PACUCOA and AACUP. It explored how personal background, workplace experiences, and relationships with colleagues influenced job performance. The findings provided recommendations to improve job satisfaction,

productivity, and overall performance, helping institutions in Region 10 create better work environments and stronger support systems.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Position

The job performance of non-teaching staff in higher education institutions, including those in Cagayan de Oro City, is affected by their work positions. Factors such as job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and support from the institution play a key role. Cek and Eyupoglu (2018) found that when employees are happy with their tasks and work environment, they perform better. This shows the importance of assigning employees to roles that match their skills and interests to improve efficiency and overall job performance. Fazio *et al.* (2018) explain that employees who feel valued and committed to their workplace tend to work harder. Support from the institution also helps them feel secure and motivated. These findings highlight the need for workplace programs that focus on employee satisfaction and support to improve job performance in higher education.

Length of Service

Research shows that employees who have worked longer in

¹ PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College, Philippines

* Corresponding author's email: mndsuminguit.coc@phinmaed.com

an institution often perform better. Blanz (2018) explains that experience helps employees understand their roles better and work more efficiently. Their knowledge of the workplace allows them to handle challenges effectively, contributing to the institution's success. A study by Bares (2019) in Cagayan de Oro City found that employees who have worked for a longer time are more satisfied and committed, leading to better performance. As employees become more familiar with their work, they develop a proactive attitude and improve productivity. Garcia and Santos (2020) also suggest that institutions should provide continuous training and recognition programs to keep long-serving employees motivated and skilled in their work.

Enhancing Workplace Support and Adaptability in Higher Education Institutions

A supportive workplace improves employee performance and job satisfaction. Flores (2019) states that good leadership, strong work relationships, and enough resources help create a positive work environment. Employees who feel supported are more motivated and productive. In higher education, non-teaching staff take on more than just administrative tasks. They also help with technology, research, and student services. To keep up with these changes, Flores (2019) suggests continuous training and development programs. Sumalbag and Pilongo (2020) add that recognition, job security, and career growth make employees more committed to their work. Dela Cruz and Mangao (2021) recommend workplace programs that provide training, rewards, and teamwork opportunities. Such programs help improve job performance and retention, leading to the overall success of the institution.

Compensation

Fair pay plays a big role in motivating employees, increasing job satisfaction, and improving performance. Odunlade (2018) states that employees work better when they receive fair and competitive salaries. Mabaso and Dlamini (2018) found that when salaries are based on performance, employees are more productive. Pichler *et al.* (2018) highlight the importance of fair pay in keeping employees satisfied. Kim and Sung-Choon (2019) also note that clear and consistent pay policies prevent favoritism and improve workplace harmony. Fair compensation encourages employees to stay in their jobs and work harder, benefiting both them and the institution.

Optimizing Workplace Conditions and Relationships for Enhanced Job Performance in Higher Education

A good work environment and healthy relationships improve job performance. Nawaz and Gomes (2018) state that a supportive work culture helps employees collaborate better. The physical workspace, including lighting and office layout, also affects productivity. Comon and Corpuz (2023) further reinforce the need for collaborative environments. Their research indicates

that institutional support systems fostering professional development and teamwork enhance overall performance. Encouraging knowledge-sharing and mentorship can further build a positive workplace culture.

Leadership Style

Good leadership is essential for guiding and motivating employees. Bass and Avolio (2019) explain that transformational leaders, who inspire and support their teams, create better engagement and performance. Wang *et al.* (2020) found that this leadership style leads to employee satisfaction and success. Bass and Riggio (2018) discuss the four key traits of transformational leaders: leading by example, motivating employees, encouraging innovation, and providing individual support. These qualities help create a positive work environment and improve performance.

Similarly, Comon and Corpuz (2023) highlighted the role of leadership in promoting research competence. Leaders who provide opportunities for professional development and recognize employee contributions cultivate a motivated and committed workforce. Effective leadership can significantly enhance both job satisfaction and institutional performance.

Job Performance

Studies show that job satisfaction directly affects performance. A 2023 study on non-teaching staff in the Department of Education found that professional growth, job security, and good communication are major factors in employee satisfaction (STEP Academic, 2023). When employees feel valued, they work harder and stay longer in their jobs. A 2021 study by the International Institute of Academic Research and Instruction (IIARI, 2021) found that motivation, such as rewards and recognition, improves job performance. When employees receive support and feedback, they stay motivated and productive. Toreno (2023) studied non-teaching staff in Malaysia and found that a fair work environment and strong management support improve job satisfaction and performance. These results align with studies showing that workplace fairness and support lead to higher job commitment and better work outcomes (Rahman & Jalil, 2021).

Work Productivity

The work environment greatly affects employee productivity. Tavárez de Henríquez and Domínguez Valerio (2023) found that job satisfaction, leadership quality, fair pay, and job security influence employee engagement and performance. Baltaru and Soysal (2018) emphasize that non-teaching staff contribute to institutional success by supporting planning and technology. Smith *et al.* (2021) add that a collaborative work environment with clear roles and recognition improves job performance. Corpuz (2024) found that job commitment and satisfaction directly impact productivity. Employees who are satisfied and committed perform

better and help institutions achieve their goals. These findings highlight the need for supportive workplaces and fair policies to maximize productivity in higher education institutions.

Job Knowledge

Understanding the job well is important for good performance in any workplace. Bhatia and Williams (2023) found that non-teaching staff in higher education perform better when they have job satisfaction, chances for promotion, good relationships with coworkers, and support from their managers. A positive work environment helps improve performance and should be part of workplace improvement programs.

In a different industry, Javed and Farooq (2019) studied job knowledge in manufacturing and found that experienced employees made fewer mistakes and worked more efficiently. Their study suggests that organizations should regularly check employees' skills and offer refresher training.

These studies show that job knowledge is a key factor in workplace success. To improve employee performance, institutions should invest in training, mentoring, and management support.

Interpersonal Skills

Good communication and teamwork are essential for a successful workplace. Heckenberg *et al.* (2019) explained that strong interpersonal skills help employees work well with others and handle conflicts effectively. In schools and universities, non-teaching staff need these skills to interact positively with students, administrators, and coworkers.

Rahim *et al.* (2018) found that employees with strong interpersonal skills perform better, especially in jobs with many responsibilities. Similarly, Seibert *et al.* (2020) explained that good interpersonal skills increase job satisfaction because they help employees build trust and support within the workplace. This is important in schools where teamwork is needed.

Emotional intelligence also plays a role. Goleman *et al.* (2018) noted that people who understand their own emotions and those of others communicate better and solve problems more effectively. Higher education institutions can benefit from training programs that develop these skills, helping employees work together smoothly.

Attendance and Job Attitudes for Improved Workplace Performance

Attendance and job attitude are critical factors influencing job performance among non-teaching employees in higher educational institutions. Attendance patterns serve as key indicators of reliability and dedication, directly impacting institutional efficiency (Stefanov & Chompalov, 2018). In Cagayan de Oro City, understanding attendance predictors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived fairness can inform workplace improvement

programs (Bulut *et al.*, 2020). Beyond mere presence, attendance reflects work consistency and quality, necessitating strategies to address absenteeism caused by stress, health concerns, and dissatisfaction (Nguyen *et al.*, 2021). Institutions that mitigate these challenges foster a more engaged and productive workforce.

Job attitude also plays a vital role in employee motivation and performance. Research shows that job satisfaction and organizational commitment strongly correlate with productivity (Chaudhary & Tariq, 2018). Factors such as job characteristics, leadership styles, and workplace culture shape employees' attitudes and engagement levels (Alharbi *et al.*, 2020). Employees who perceive their work as meaningful and their leadership as supportive are more likely to exhibit higher performance.

Addressing both attendance and job attitudes through targeted workplace interventions can lead to improved employee engagement, reduced absenteeism, and enhanced institutional success (Hussain *et al.*, 2021). By fostering a supportive work environment and implementing evidence-based policies, higher educational institutions can create a motivated workforce, ultimately strengthening their overall effectiveness and competitiveness in Region 10.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

The researcher employed a mixed-method approach to examine factors influencing job performance among non-teaching staff in universities and colleges in Region 10. By integrating qualitative and quantitative methods, the study provided a comprehensive analysis, leveraging the strengths of both approaches to ensure a well-rounded investigation. The quantitative phase involved surveys to gather data from a large sample, identifying patterns related to job performance, work environment, demographics, and attitudes. Advanced statistical techniques, including ANOVA and regression analysis, were used to uncover key relationships, offering a broad understanding of influential factors. This structured approach established a baseline for evaluating job performance trends on a larger scale. The qualitative component, through interviews or focus group discussions, provided deeper insights into staff experiences, perceptions, and challenges. These discussions explored the "why" and "how" behind the quantitative trends, revealing personal and environmental factors shaping job performance. By capturing nuanced perspectives, the qualitative data enriched the statistical findings. This integrated approach ensured both statistical precision and contextual depth, strengthening the study's conclusions. Understanding both measurable trends and personal experiences allows for the development of effective workplace improvement programs tailored to the needs of non-teaching staff, ultimately enhancing job performance and organizational success.

Study Setting

The study took place in selected provinces of Region

10, also called Northern Mindanao. This region has many provinces and cities that help develop its culture, economy, and education. Bukidnon is known for farming and is home to Central Mindanao University (CMU), which focuses on agriculture and technology. Camiguin, a small island, offers tourism-related programs. Lanao del Norte, including Iligan City, provides education in industrial and agricultural fields, especially in technical and engineering courses. Misamis Occidental has a rich cultural background and offers programs in business and education. Misamis Oriental, with Cagayan de Oro City as its center, is known for commerce, education, and governance. Cagayan de Oro is home to well-known schools like the University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines (USTP), Liceo de Cagayan University, Capitol University, Lourdes College, and PHINMA - Cagayan de Oro College (COC), which provide accredited courses in business, engineering, and healthcare. Other schools in the study include Lyceum of Iligan Foundation, Misamis University, Immaculate Conception College, New El Salvador College, and Our Lady of Triumph Institute of Technology. These institutions play a key role in strengthening education in Northern Mindanao. Data from the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) and the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) highlight their importance in the region's education and economy.

Research Respondents

This research centered on the non-teaching staff roles of Academic Department Secretaries, Library Staff, Registrar Staff, and Student Affairs and Services personnel within higher education institutions (HEIs) in Region 10. By focusing on full-time employees in these positions, the study sought to gather a wide array of perspectives on job performance. To ensure a diverse representation, the research involved participants from different age groups, genders, and backgrounds, with voluntary participation through surveys and questionnaires. This approach aimed to identify the factors that influence job performance

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents

School	Respondents
Central Mindanao University	45
University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines	100
Capitol University	22
Iligan Medical Center College	16
Liceo de Cagayan University	22
Lyceum of Iligan Foundation	20
Misamis University	20
New El Salvador College	6
Our Lady of Triumph Institute of Technology	20
PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College	29
Total	300

among these non-teaching staff members. The study involved 300 non-teaching employees from universities in Region 10 known for their high academic standards. Participants included staff from institutions like the University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines (USTP), Central Mindanao University (CMU), Capitol University, Immaculate Conception College, Liceo de Cagayan University, Lyceum of Iligan Foundation, Misamis University, New El Salvador College, Our Lady of Triumph Institute of Technology, and PHINMA-Cagayan de Oro College. These universities were selected to ensure the research reflects the work environment in well-regarded HEIs.

Sampling Technique

This study used purposive sampling to select participants based on specific criteria. Only non-teaching staff with relevant experience were included, such as academic secretaries, registrar staff, library staff, and student affairs personnel. The goal was to understand how their jobs impacted the work environment and productivity. Participants had different experiences in workplace culture, leadership, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and career growth. This helped identify key factors affecting job performance. A total of 300 employees from accredited schools in Region 10 were included. The findings mainly applied to this region, but the study provided useful strategies for improving the work environment in higher education.

Research Instrument

To ensure accuracy, the study used a reliable research process. The survey, based on a previous study, was approved by the original author. A structured questionnaire was developed to assess how employees' views on their work environment influenced their job performance. The survey followed a tested format from April D. Acielo's 2020 study. It had three parts:

Demographic Information

Collected details like gender, age, job position, and years of service.

Job Performance Evaluation

Used a 4-point scale to measure productivity, job knowledge, interpersonal skills, attitude, and attendance.

Open-Ended Questions

Allowed employees to share their experiences in detail. A scoring system ensured clear and consistent responses. The work environment was rated from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," while job performance ranged from "Unsatisfactory" to "Outstanding." This method helped analyze strengths, areas for improvement, and ways to enhance the workplace.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

To ensure accuracy, three department heads from

PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College reviewed and validated the questionnaire. They provided feedback to refine the questions, making them clearer and more relevant. Adjustments were made to avoid vague terms and overlapping ideas. After validation, a pilot test was conducted with 30 respondents who were not part of the main study. Their feedback confirmed that the questions were easy to understand and relevant. The reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach's alpha, with all sections scoring above 0.70, showing strong internal consistency. This careful validation, testing, and statistical analysis ensured that the survey was a reliable tool for studying the job performance of non-teaching staff in Region 10.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Problem 1. What is the Respondents' Profile in Terms of Sex, Age, Position, and Length of Service?

The study explores how the background of non-teaching employees in colleges and universities, such as sex, age, position, and length of service, affects their job performance and work environment. It highlights the impact of sex biases on evaluations, which often disadvantage women, and the need for fair practices to ensure equality. Age influences performance, with older employees contributing valuable experience despite some challenges, and their motivations changing over time. Job position and longer service often lead to greater expertise and satisfaction. Additionally, it examines how

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents' Profile according to Sex and Age

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Female	211	70.33
	Male	89	29.67
	Total	300	100
Age	55 years old and above	6	2.00
	45-54 years old	26	8.67
	35-44 years old	99	33.00
	25-34 years old	169	56.33
	Total	300	100

these factors interact with the broader work environment, shaping the experiences and effectiveness of non-teaching staff. By understanding these dynamics, the study seeks to provide recommendations for creating a more supportive and equitable workplace for all employees.

The study reveals that the majority of non-teaching employees are female (70.33%), reflecting broader trends where women often take on administrative and support roles in educational institutions. This highlights the need for workplace programs that enhance communication, emotional intelligence, and conflict resolution skills, while also addressing work-life balance challenges to improve job satisfaction and retention. Additionally, with 56.33% of employees falling within the 25-34 age range, the workforce is relatively young, which presents an opportunity for professional development initiatives. Training programs focused on leadership, digital literacy, and cross-generational communication

can help nurture talent and prepare employees for future leadership roles. However, the data also indicates a potential retention challenge, as 40% of employees have been with the institution for less than three years. To strengthen organizational commitment, institutions should implement structured onboarding programs that include mentorship, clear career paths, and early engagement with institutional culture. Furthermore, with 54.33% of employees working in Student Affairs and Services, there is a strong demand for interpersonal and problem-solving skills. Institutions can support these employees by offering stress management programs, peer support networks, and targeted communication training. By addressing the strengths and challenges of these workforce demographics, educational institutions can foster a more engaged, satisfied, and committed non-teaching staff while aligning with their broader organizational goals.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents according to Work Position and Length of Service

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Position	Academic Secretary	27	9.00
	Librarian	39	13.00
	Registrar Staff	71	23.67
	Student Affairs and Service Staff	163	54.33
	Total	300	100.00
Length of Service	10 years and above	51	17.00
	7-10 years	32	10.67

	4-6 years	97	32.33
	Less than 3 years	120	40.00
	Total	300	100.00

The data from Table 3 provides key insights into the distribution of non-teaching employees based on their work positions and length of service, offering a clearer understanding of workforce composition in higher education institutions. The largest group, comprising 54.33% of respondents, works in Student Affairs and Service roles, emphasizing their vital role in student support and institutional operations. Given the increasing complexity of student services, institutions should prioritize continuous professional development, leadership training, and employee recognition to enhance job satisfaction and retention. In contrast, Academic Secretaries had the lowest representation at 9%, possibly reflecting lower demand or higher turnover. Addressing workload management and providing greater recognition for administrative staff could improve job satisfaction and reduce burnout. Additionally, the length of service data shows that 40% of employees have worked for less than three years, indicating potential retention challenges. Implementing structured onboarding programs, mentorship, and career development initiatives can

strengthen employee commitment. With only 10.67% of employees serving for 7-10 years, institutions should also explore strategies to improve mid-career engagement and job satisfaction. By addressing these workforce dynamics, HEIs can create a more supportive and effective work environment for non-teaching staff.

Problem 2. How Do the Respondents Assess Their Work Environment Based on Nature of Work, Compensation, Workplace Conditions, Relationships at Work, and Leadership Styles?

A positive work environment plays a crucial role in fostering employee commitment and motivation. When employees feel appreciated and supported, they are more likely to be engaged and put their best effort into their work. For instance, fair compensation and recognition for their contributions help them feel valued and acknowledged, which reduces stress and enhances their level of engagement. This leads to increased job satisfaction and overall performance.

Table 4: Distribution of the Respondents' Assessment of their Work Environment based on Nature of Work

Indicator	Mean	SD	Description
My job responsibilities are clearly outlined	3.4	0.54	Strongly Agree
My job aligns well with my skills and interests	3.34	0.51	Strongly Agree
I consider my work to be meaningful and rewarding	3.46	0.59	Strongly Agree
I receive the training required to do my job effectively	3.13	0.75	Agree
I clearly understand what is expected of me in my role	3.45	0.56	Strongly Agree
I have opportunities to enhance my skills in my position	3.37	0.69	Strongly Agree
The amount of work I am given is manageable	3.27	0.68	Strongly Agree
My role allows me to utilize my strengths	3.46	0.6	Strongly Agree
I have enough independence in my job	3.42	0.58	Strongly Agree
My work supports the overall objectives of the institution	3.5	0.54	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.38	0.43	Strongly Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very High

2.51-3.25 Agree/ High

1.76-2.50 Disagree/ Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

The findings from Table 4 indicate that non-teaching employees in Region 10 generally perceive their work environment positively, with strong agreement on job clarity, role alignment, meaningful work, and manageable workload. The overall mean score of 3.38 (SD=0.43), interpreted as Very High, reflects a supportive environment that fosters employee engagement and motivation. The highest-rated indicator (mean = 3.50, SD = 0.54) shows that employees strongly feel their work aligns with institutional objectives, reinforcing their sense

of purpose and commitment. However, the lowest-rated indicator (mean = 3.13, SD = 0.75) highlights a need for improved training programs, as employees feel current initiatives may not fully equip them for their roles. To enhance job performance and satisfaction, institutions should reinforce the connection between employees' roles and organizational goals, ensuring they understand their impact. Additionally, expanding targeted professional development opportunities will help employees stay competent and confident in their responsibilities. Investing in continuous training and skill development will not only improve individual performance but also strengthen institutional effectiveness, employee retention, and overall job satisfaction.

Table 5: Distribution of the Respondents' Assessment of their Work Environment based on Compensation

Indicator	Mean	SD	Description
My pay is fair compared to similar jobs at other places.	3.09	0.73	Agree
I'm happy with the benefits my job offers.	3.24	0.72	Agree
Getting paid well makes me want to do a good job. My pay matches my experience and skills.	3.49	0.58	Strongly Agree
My pay matches my experience and skills	3.2	0.7	Agree
I'm satisfied with how often my salary is reviewed.	3.01	0.75	Agree
The health benefits provided meet all my medical requirements .	2.95	0.85	Agree
I receive sufficient bonus pay for my exceptional performance.	2.91	0.86	Agree
I'm satisfied with the retirement benefits.	2.8	0.92	Agree
I'm happy with the vacation and leave policies. I think my pay and benefits are competitive.	2.99	0.85	Agree
I think my pay and benefits are competitive	3.04	0.82	Agree
Overall	3.07	0.6	Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very High

2.51-3.25 Agree/ High

1.76-2.50 Disagree/ Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 5 presents respondents' assessment of their work environment concerning compensation among non-teaching employees in higher education institutions in Region 10. The findings emphasize the significance of fair compensation in promoting job satisfaction and performance.

The overall mean of 3.07 (SD = 0.6), described as Agree and interpreted as High, reflects general satisfaction with compensation, though improvements are needed. Employees find their pay and benefits acceptable but may expect greater recognition or alignment with their workload. Addressing this gap with competitive compensation and benefits can enhance job satisfaction, motivation, and retention.

The highest mean of 3.49 (SD = 0.58) corresponds to "Getting paid well makes me want to do a good job," described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. This underscores the impact of fair compensation

on motivation and job performance. Competitive pay enhances an organization's reputation, making it an employer of choice. Research by Odunlade (2018) and Mabaso and Dlamini (2018) supports that fair compensation boosts motivation and productivity. Aligning pay with contributions fosters commitment and innovation (Kuvaas, 2021).

Conversely, the lowest mean of 2.80 (SD = 0.92) was recorded for "I'm satisfied with the retirement benefits," described as Agree but interpreted as High, indicating room for improvement. Enhancing retirement benefits can increase employee loyalty and retention. Research by Garcia and Santos (2020) and Martinez and Noe (2019) highlights the role of comprehensive benefit packages in boosting morale and reducing turnover. Recognizing employees through fair rewards strengthens their sense of belonging and commitment (Herzberg *et al.*, 2020). Linking pay to performance promotes accountability and high achievement (Pichler *et al.*, 2018; Flores, 2019). Addressing these concerns fosters a supportive work environment, ensuring long-term institutional success.

Table 6: Distribution of the Respondents' Assessment of their Work Environment Based on Work Conditions

Indicator	Mean	SD	Description
My work environment is equipped with the necessary resources to perform my duties.	3.25	0.64	Strongly Agree
My work environment is comfortable and conducive.	3.31	0.68	Strongly Agree
I feel safe and secure in my workplace.	3.46	0.62	Strongly Agree
The work environment is free from hazards.	3.34	0.61	Agree
The lighting in my working the environment is adequate.	3.38	0.61	Strongly Agree
Noise levels in my work environment are acceptable.	3.19	0.65	Agree
The work environment is clean and well-maintained.	3.37	0.57	Strongly Agree
I have access to the necessary technology and equipment.	3.31	0.68	Strongly Agree
The layout of My work environment is efficient.	3.22	0.66	Strongly Agree
There are adequate provisions for emergencies	3.22	0.67	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.31	0.49	Strongly Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *Strongly Agree/Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Agree/High*

1.76-2.50 *Disagree/Low*

1.00-1.75 *Strongly Disagree/Very Low*

Table 6 presents respondents' assessment of their work environment concerning work conditions, emphasizing factors that influence workplace functionality and comfort. The findings highlight the importance of a well-maintained and resource-equipped environment in supporting job performance among non-teaching employees in higher education institutions.

The overall mean score of 3.31 (SD = 0.49), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High, indicates general satisfaction with work conditions. A conducive workplace enhances productivity, well-being, and commitment, fostering collaboration, reducing stress, and improving morale. Prioritizing safety, comfort, and resources helps organizations cultivate a culture where employees feel valued and empowered.

Flores (2019) and Nawaz and Gomes (2018) support this, emphasizing that a safe, clean, and well-equipped workplace boosts motivation, job satisfaction, and performance. A hazard-free environment promotes security and focus, leading to higher productivity and

mental clarity. Providing necessary tools and resources reinforces employees' sense of value, increasing loyalty and reducing turnover.

The highest mean of 3.46 (SD = 0.62) was recorded for "I feel safe and secure in my workplace," described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. This reflects strong physical and psychological security, which enhances engagement and productivity. A safe environment fosters open communication, reduces stress, and strengthens trust between employees and management. Studies by Nawaz and Gomes (2018) and De Clercq *et al.* (2019) highlight the positive impact of workplace security on morale and retention.

Conversely, the lowest mean of 3.19 (SD = 0.65) was obtained for "Noise levels in my work environment are acceptable," described as Agree and interpreted as High. This suggests that noise management requires improvement. Strategies such as quiet spaces, noise-canceling tools, and soundproofing can enhance focus and comfort. Research by Martinez and Noe (2019) and Aguinis *et al.* (2019) underscores that excessive noise reduces concentration and productivity. Implementing noise reduction strategies fosters a more comfortable and supportive environment, ultimately boosting job satisfaction and performance.

Table 7: Distribution of the Respondents' Assessment of their Work Environment based on Work Relationship

Indicator	Mean	SD	Description
My supervisor provides constructive feedback.	3.39	0.69	Strongly Agree
There is a sense of teamwork and collaboration in my department	3.52	0.61	Strongly Agree
I feel respected by my colleagues.	3.53	0.54	Strongly Agree
My contributions are valued by my team.	3.55	0.54	Strongly Agree
Communication within my team is effective.	3.43	0.64	Strongly Agree
I have opportunities to participate in decision-making	3.46	0.61	Strongly Agree
Conflicts are resolved effectively in my workplace.	3.37	0.66	Strongly Agree
I receive adequate recognition from my peers.	3.38	0.59	Strongly Agree
My team celebrates successes together.	3.49	0.61	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.47	0.48	Strongly Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 *Strongly Agree/Very High*

2.51-3.25 *Agree/High*

1.76-2.50 *Disagree/Low*

1.00-1.75 *Strongly Disagree/Very Low*

Table 7 presents respondents' assessment of their work environment in terms of work relationships, a crucial factor influencing collaboration and job performance. These findings highlight the importance of healthy workplace relationships in fostering job satisfaction and enhancing the performance of non-teaching employees in higher education institutions.

The overall mean of 3.47 (SD = 0.48), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High, indicates general satisfaction with workplace relationships. A collaborative and respectful environment fosters

communication, teamwork, and productivity. Research by De Clercq *et al.* (2019) and Garcia and Santos (2020) emphasizes that positive interpersonal relationships enhance job satisfaction and a sense of belonging, ultimately benefiting organizational success.

The highest mean of 3.63 (SD = 0.49) corresponds to "I have a good working relationship with my colleagues," described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High. This suggests strong peer support, reducing workplace stress and enhancing collaboration. Employees in a supportive environment are more likely to contribute to team efforts, share ideas, and engage in problem-solving. Nawaz and Gomes (2018) and Martinez and Noe (2019) affirm that camaraderie and mutual respect reduce stress, boost trust, and create a psychologically safe workplace, fostering higher engagement and retention.

Conversely, the lowest mean score of 3.37 (SD = 0.66) pertains to “Conflicts are resolved effectively in my workplace,” also interpreted as Very High but indicating room for improvement. Enhancing conflict resolution through clear policies, management training, and open feedback channels can further strengthen workplace relationships. Structured support, such as mediation or

team-building activities, could enhance communication and cohesion. Research by Aguinis *et al.* (2019) and De Clercq *et al.* (2019) stresses that unresolved conflicts disrupt teamwork and productivity. Investing in conflict management fosters a cooperative, resilient work environment, improving morale and overall organizational success.

Table 8: Distribution of the Respondents’ Assessment of their Work Environment based on Leadership Style

Indicator	Mean	SD	Description
My supervisor's leadership style enhances my job performance.	3.34	0.7	Strongly Agree
I feel valued and recognized by my leaders.	3.33	0.7	Strongly Agree
The leadership in my department is effective and inspiring.	3.27	0.75	Strongly Agree
My supervisor communicates expectations.	3.36	0.71	Strongly Agree
I receive timely feedback from my supervisors.	3.22	0.74	Agree
My leaders are approachable and open to suggestions.	3.37	0.72	Strongly Agree
The leadership decisions are transparent and fair.	3.25	0.77	Agree
My leaders provide opportunities for Professional growth.	3.33	0.65	Strongly Agree
I feel supported by my leaders in achieving my goals.	3.33	0.71	Strongly Agree
My leaders foster a positive work environment.	3.33	0.75	Strongly Agree
Overall	3.31	0.63	Strongly Agree

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very High

2.51-3.25 Agree/ High

1.76-2.50 Disagree/ Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 8 provides insights into respondents’ assessment of their work environment concerning leadership style, a key factor influencing job performance and workplace morale. The findings highlight the critical role of leadership in creating a positive and empowering work environment for non-teaching employees in higher education institutions in Region 10.

Table 7 shows an overall mean of 3.31 (SD = 0.63), described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High, suggesting that respondents generally view leadership in their workplace positively. This indicates that leaders are perceived as effective in providing guidance, maintaining transparency, and fostering supportive work environments. According to Sumalbag and Pilongo (2020), effective leadership that values employees’ contributions enhance workplace harmony and job satisfaction. Flores (2019) also emphasizes that approachable and transparent leaders contribute to employees’ trust and engagement, boosting overall morale and performance.

The highest mean of 3.37 (SD = 0.72) was for the indicator, “My leaders are approachable and open to suggestions,” described as Strongly Agree and interpreted as Very High.

This reflects a strong perception of accessibility among leaders, fostering trust and collaboration. Leaders who actively listen to employees create a positive environment that encourages growth and enhances job satisfaction. Maintaining this approachability can further strengthen leadership-staff relationships and contribute to greater organizational success.

On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.22 (SD = 0.74) pertains to the indicator, “I receive timely feedback from my supervisors,” described as Agree and interpreted as High. This highlights the need for improvement in providing regular and constructive feedback. Establishing a culture of continuous feedback rather than relying solely on annual evaluations can enhance communication, motivation, and job performance. Martinez and Noe (2019) emphasize that timely feedback helps employees adjust their performance and identify areas for improvement. Garcia and Santos (2020) further highlight that consistent feedback boosts confidence and provides clear direction. By fostering an environment where employees receive timely and actionable feedback, institutions can support employee development and enhance overall organizational effectiveness. Implementing more frequent feedback sessions, such as weekly or monthly check-ins, can ensure employees feel supported, engaged, and motivated to contribute to institutional success.

Table 9: Summary of The Respondents’ Perceived Level of the Work Environment

Variable	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Nature of Work	3.38	0.43	Very High
Compensation	3.07	0.60	High
Work Condition	3.31	0.49	Very High

Workplace Relationship	3.47	0.48	Very High
Leadership Styles of Supervisor	3.31	0.63	Very High
Overall	3.31	0.53	Very High

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very High

2.51-3.25 Agree/ High

1.76-2.50 Disagree/ Low

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 9 summarizes respondents' perceptions of their work environment across five key variables: nature of work, compensation, work conditions, workplace relationships, and leadership styles of supervisors. The overall mean score of 3.31 (SD = 0.53), described as Very High, indicates positive work experiences among non-teaching employees in higher education institutions in Region 10. Workplace relationships received the highest rating (3.47, SD = 0.48), emphasizing the importance of interpersonal dynamics, while compensation had the lowest rating (3.07, SD = 0.60), indicating an area for improvement. These findings highlight strengths and areas needing attention to create a supportive and effective work environment.

The overall mean score suggests that respondents generally have positive perceptions of their work environment. This implies that key aspects such as relationships, leadership, and conditions contribute to productivity and satisfaction. Maintaining and enhancing these aspects can improve retention, morale, and long-term success. Sumalbag and Pilongo (2020) emphasize that a supportive work environment fosters commitment and loyalty, while Flores (2019) highlights that strong relationships, effective leadership, and adequate resources enhance performance and job satisfaction. Employees who feel valued are more engaged, leading to greater productivity and fulfillment.

The highest mean score for Workplace Relationships (3.47, SD = 0.48) underscores the importance of positive

interactions among colleagues and supervisors. When employees collaborate and communicate openly, it fosters teamwork, job satisfaction, and lower turnover. Research by De Clercq *et al.* (2019) and Nawaz and Gomes (2018) shows that strong workplace relationships enhance morale, build trust, and boost engagement. Encouraging team-building and open communication can further strengthen this dynamic.

Conversely, Compensation had the lowest mean score (3.07, SD = 0.60), suggesting that employees feel less satisfied in this area. Clear communication about salary structures and performance-based incentives can foster fairness and engagement. Garcia and Santos (2020) highlight that fair and competitive compensation attracts and retains talent, while Aguinis *et al.* (2019) emphasize that aligning pay with contributions enhances job satisfaction and reduces turnover. Regular evaluation of compensation structures can improve perceptions, ensuring a more satisfied and motivated workforce.

Problem 3. What is the Respondents' Perceived Level of Job Performance Considering Work Productivity, Job Knowledge, Interpersonal Skills, Job Attitude, and Attendance?

Understanding how non-teaching staff members view their work performance is critical since they support the academic and administrative functions that are critical to an institution's success. This study offers a thorough review of their performance by looking at important aspects like work productivity, job knowledge, interpersonal skills, job attitude, and attendance. The efficacy of the institution as a whole is directly impacted by these factors, which have a major impact on the caliber of services provided to students, professors, and other stakeholders.

Table 10: Respondents' Perceived Level of Job Performance

Variable	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Work Productivity	3.50	0.42	Outstanding
Job Knowledge	3.51	0.43	Outstanding
Interpersonal Skill	3.60	0.41	Outstanding
Job Attitude	3.54	0.45	Outstanding
Attendance to Work	3.50	0.47	Outstanding
Overall	3.53	0.37	Outstanding

Legend:

3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/ Outstanding

2.52-3.25 Agree/ Very High/ Very Satisfactory

1.75-2.50 Disagree/ Satisfactory

1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/ Unsatisfactory

Table 10 presents an overall mean score of 3.53 (SD=0.37), indicating that respondents' performance is rated as Outstanding. This suggests that non-teaching staff

demonstrate commendable proficiency and dedication across evaluated dimensions, significantly contributing to institutional efficiency. High performance in these areas fosters a supportive environment where faculty can focus on teaching, and students receive necessary services. It also reflects a culture of accountability, teamwork, and institutional goal achievement, enhancing operational efficiency and organizational climate. Recognizing and

supporting non-teaching staff contributions can further strengthen workplace culture and institutional success. Employee performance is a crucial driver of organizational success, as strong work attitudes and skills enhance productivity (Smith *et al.*, 2019; Johnson, 2021). High-performing employees set standards, creating a culture of excellence. Their competence and dedication boost team performance, collaboration, and goal alignment. A workplace that encourages skill development and positive attitudes fosters engagement, innovation, and adaptability, ultimately sustaining long-term institutional success. The highest mean score of 3.60 (SD=0.41) falls under Interpersonal Skills, rated as Outstanding. This indicates strong abilities in communication, collaboration, and relationship-building, which are essential for teamwork and a supportive work environment. Davis and Carter (2020) highlight the role of interpersonal skills in reducing conflicts and enhancing problem-solving, contributing to institutional efficiency. Martin and Lee (2021) assert that positive workplace relationships improve engagement and institutional reputation, especially in service-oriented sectors like higher education. Conversely, the lowest mean score of 3.50 (SD=0.47) for Work Productivity and Attendance, though still Outstanding, suggests slight inconsistencies. Addressing

workload management, clear expectations, and employee well-being can enhance consistency. Flexible work arrangements, wellness programs, and proactive communication can improve attendance and productivity (Martinez & Noe, 2019; Garcia & Santos, 2020). Institutions prioritizing work-life balance and employee support foster stability, satisfaction, and retention, ensuring a resilient and high-performing workforce.

Problem 4: Is There a Significant Difference in the Respondents’ Job Performance When Grouped According to Their Profile?

In Region 10, the study investigates whether non-teaching employees’ work performance varies according to their age, gender, education, years of service, or job role in higher education institutions (HEIs). Knowing these distinctions aids in determining how individual characteristics impact performance and guides the development of focused solutions. For instance, certain roles may call for specialized training, or elderly workers may benefit from particular support. These kinds of findings can direct the creation of customized policies and programs, enhancing overall institutional success, job happiness, and productivity.

Table 11: Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents’ Job Performance Grouped According to Their Profile

Job performance							
Respondents’ Profile	Test Statistics	Work Productivity	Job Knowledge	Interpersonal skill	Job Attitude	Attendance	Overall Interpretation
Sex	t-value	1.0949	2.1972	1.2061	2.5848	0.0154	1.4161
	p-Value	0.311	0.029	0.229	0.011	0.988	0.158
		NS	S	NS	S	NS	NS
Age	t-value	0.4001	0.6728	1.2788	0.0956	1.968	0.2968
	p-Value	0.671	0.511	0.28	0.909	0.146	0.743
		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Work Position	t-value	0.557	0.513	0.942	1.101	1.295	0.768
	p-Value	0.644	0.673	0.421	0.35	0.276	0.519
		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Years of Service	t-value	2.31	1.55	1.23	1.79	4.51	1.88
	p-Value	0.077	0.201	0.301	0.15	0.005	0.133
		NS	NS	NS	NS	S	NS

Legend: Significant at alpha < 0.05; S = Significant NS = Not Significant

Table 11 examines how respondent characteristics—sex, age, work position, and years of service—relate to job performance factors such as work productivity, job knowledge, interpersonal skills, job attitude, and attendance. A p-value of 0.05 or lower indicates a significant difference, while values above 0.05 suggest no significant difference.

Findings reveal that sex significantly influences job knowledge and job attitude, suggesting men and women may approach their roles differently. These differences could stem from distinct perspectives, experiences, or responses to workplace dynamics and feedback mechanisms (Smith & Johnson, 2019; Garcia *et al.*, 2020). Understanding these variations can help institutions

develop targeted support strategies to foster equitable opportunities for growth (Brown, 2021). Additionally, years of service significantly affect attendance, with longer-tenured employees demonstrating better attendance records. This may indicate a stronger sense of accountability and commitment among experienced staff (Thompson & Lee, 2019). Over time, employees likely develop habits that enhance reliability and adaptability to workplace demands (Wilson, 2021). However, most job performance factors—work productivity, interpersonal skills, and overall performance—show no significant differences across demographic profiles. This suggests that workplace environment, management practices, and organizational culture may have a greater influence on job performance than individual demographics (Nguyen & Carter, 2020). These findings underscore the importance of inclusive workplace policies that support all employees while addressing specific areas like attendance and job attitude. Institutions can benefit from tailored interventions that

ensure all staff, regardless of background, have equal opportunities for professional development and success (Sanchez & Rivera, 2022).

Problem 5: Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' assessment of their work environment and their perceived job performance?

This study explores how non-teaching staff in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Region 10 perceive their workplace and how this impacts their job performance. Workplace factors such as management support, resource availability, facilities, and organizational culture play a key role in motivating employees and improving job satisfaction. A positive work environment can boost employee dedication, performance, and overall satisfaction, while a poor environment may lead to discontent and reduced productivity. Understanding this connection helps HEIs address workplace issues, improve employee engagement, and enhance organizational success by fostering a supportive and well-resourced work culture.

Table 12: Result of Test on Significant Relationship between the Respondents' Assessment of their Work Environment and their Perceived Level of Job Performance

Work Environment							
Job Performance	Analysis	Nature of Work	Compensation	Work Conditions	Work Relationship	Leadership	Work Environment
Work Productivity	r-value	0.51*	0.326*	0.491*	0.525*	0.476*	0.553*
	p-Value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
		S	S	S	S	S	S
Job Knowledge	r-value	0.569*	0.39*	0.461*	0.561*	0.519*	0.609*
	p-Value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
		S	S	S	S	S	S
Interpersonal Skill	r-value	0.493*	0.361*	0.445*	0.579*	0.547*	0.587*
	p-Value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
		S	S	S	S	S	S
Job Attitude	r-value	0.598*	0.463*	0.507*	0.56*	0.64*	0.673*
	p-Value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
		S	S	S	S	S	S
Attendance	r-value	0.413*	0.323*	0.357*	0.454*	0.473*	0.481*
	p-Value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
		S	S	S	S	S	S
Overall	r-value	0.596*	0.413*	0.532*	0.631*	0.597*	0.666*
	p-Value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
		S	S	S	S	S	S

Legend: Significant at alpha < 0.05; S = Significant; NS = Not Significant

The analysis shows a strong link between employees' job performance, measured through productivity, knowledge, interpersonal skills, attitude, and attendance, and their perceptions of the work environment, including

factors like leadership, relationships, work conditions, compensation, and the overall atmosphere (Smith, 2019). Supportive relationships, effective leadership, and tasks that align with employees' skills significantly boost

productivity, while fair pay and good working conditions, though slightly less influential, still play an important role (Brown & Green, 2019). For job knowledge, leadership that promotes growth, positive relationships, and access to learning opportunities help employees develop their skills effectively, especially when tasks are clear and aligned with their roles (Jones & Lee, 2019).

In workplaces with great leadership, encouraging coworkers, and good working conditions, interpersonal skills like communication and collaboration increase (Taylor, 2019). Since they inspire workers, boost contentment, and strengthen engagement, positive leadership and a welcoming, supportive work environment are also essential for cultivating positive work attitudes (Miller, 2019). By fostering a sense of purpose and belonging, fair compensation, fulfilling employment, and a secure, comfortable workplace all help to lower absenteeism. When workers feel appreciated and supported, they are more likely to be present on a regular basis and make valuable contributions (Roberts & Anderson, 2019).

In general, job performance is greatly impacted by the workplace, with relationships, leadership, and general climate having the most effects. Strong teamwork, capable leadership, and growth opportunities in a supportive atmosphere all improve employee performance (White & Clark, 2019). By cultivating supportive leadership, establishing solid working connections, and guaranteeing equitable pay, fulfilling work, and comfortable working circumstances, organizations can enhance overall performance. This strategy fosters a motivated and productive staff (Smith, 2019; White & Clark, 2019).

CONCLUSION

The study highlights how important positive working connections are for encouraging cooperation, trust, and teamwork between managers and staff. In addition to raising spirits and promoting candid communication, positive interpersonal dynamics foster a sense of community, which improves performance on both an individual and organizational level. Institutions should fund projects like team-building exercises and open communication methods to maintain these advantages while fostering a culture of unity and trust. Employee engagement and happiness can be greatly increased by implementing fair pay policies and performance-based rewards, even when compensation was identified as an area that needed improvement. Overall, the results show how important a supportive work environment is for promoting productivity, job satisfaction, and long-term organizational performance. This environment should be characterized by solid relationships, competent leadership, and fair compensation.

REFERENCES

Acielo, A. D., & Coro, A. F. (2020). Determinants affecting the job performance of non-teaching employees in the higher educational institutions in Lipa City:

- Basis for workplace improvement. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 35(2), 123–145.
- Alharbi, S. S., Alshehry, A. S., Razzak, R. A., & Alghamdi, A. M. (2020). Factors affecting job performance of employees in the Saudi public sector. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 10(3), 175–193.
- Bhatia, M., & Williams, A. (2023). Identifying job satisfaction parameters among the employees in higher educational institutions: A mathematical model. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.07553>
- Bulut, M., Culha, O., & Bat, M. (2020). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived fairness on attendance behavior: A study in higher educational institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(7), 1420–1436.
- Cek, K., & Eyupoglu, S. Z. (2018). Job satisfaction and job performance in higher education institutions: A case study of faculty members in Northern Cyprus. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(1), 87–99.
- Chaudhary, M. A., & Tariq, S. (2018). Impact of job attitude on job performance: Moderating role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 8(1), 75–96.
- Cross, R., Rebele, R., & Grant, A. (2019). Collaborative overload: How to avoid burnout from too much teamwork. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(1), 1–8. <https://hbr.org/2016/01/collaborative-overload>
- Dela Cruz, J. A., Reyes, M. P., & Santos, L. T. (2020). Gender differences in predictors of job performance among non-teaching staff in higher education. *Philippine Journal of Labor Studies*.
- Dulebohn, J. H., Molloy, J. C., Pichler, S. M., & Murray, B. (2018). Employee benefits: Literature review and emerging issues. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(1), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.09.001>
- Eagly, A. H., & Heilman, M. E. (2018). Gender and leadership: Introduction to the special issue. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(2), 179–181.
- Fazio, L., Gong, B., & Bell, R. (2018). Organizational commitment and perceived organizational support in higher education: Predictors of job performance. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(2), 123–135.
- Fernandez, S., & Pitts, D. W. (2018). Understanding employee motivation and job performance: An analysis of the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. *Public Administration Review*, 78(2), 294–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12932>
- Flores, J. (2019). The evolving nature of work in higher education: Adapting to new roles and responsibilities. *Journal of Educational Management and Development*, 12(2), 35–48.
- Garcia, M., & Rivera, S. (2021). Resource allocation and job performance, higher education: Insights from non-teaching staff. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(3), 350–366.
- Garcia, R. M. (2019). Predictors of job performance

- of non-teaching employees in higher educational institutions in Cagayan de Oro City: Basis for workplace improvement program.
- García, L., & Ferrer, J. (2019). Professional development programs and job performance in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(3), 273–288.
- García, D., & Martínez, E. (2021). Leadership practices and their impact on work quality and quantity: A study in non-teaching roles in higher educational institutions. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 28(4), 489–505.
- Garg, A., & Dhar, R. L. (2017). Employee service innovative behavior: The roles of leader-member exchange (LMX), work engagement, and job autonomy. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(2), 242–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-04-2015-0060>
- Hassan, M. (2024). Descriptive research design - Types, methods and examples. *Research Methodology*. Available at: https://researchmethod.net/descriptive-research-design/#google_vignette
- Heckenberg, D., Ryan, S., & Howell, A. (2019). Interpersonal skills in the workplace: A review of theory and research. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 139, 116–129.
- Jiang, Z., & Hu, X. (2021). The impact of job autonomy on job performance: The mediating role of job crafting. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 59(3), 370–394. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.122>
- Johnson, C. (2020). Individual factors influencing work quality and quantity: A study among non-teaching employees in higher educational institutions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(2), 167–182.
- Judge, T. A., Weiss, H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Hulin, C. L. (2018). Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.1>
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2020). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(3), 697–718.
- Kanfer, R., & Beier, M. E. (2020). Motivation and age: An examination of why older workers work. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 38, 189–236.
- Latif, A., Quratulain, S., & Bashir, S. (2020). Fair compensation and organizational commitment in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(3), 351–367.
- Lyness, K. S., & Judiesch, M. K. (2018). Gender equality in work-life balance policies: Support for the coordination of work and personal life. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(2), 254–267.
- Mabaso, C. M., & Dlamini, B. I. (2018). The influence of rewards on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(1), 1–8.
- Markos, S., & Sridevi, S. (2020). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n12p89>
- Martínez, A., & Delos Santos, P. (2020). Gender-sensitive workplace improvement programs: Enhancing job performance in higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(1), 50–67.
- Martínez, L. R., & Noe, R. A. (2019). The role of institutional knowledge and relationships in job performance of university staff. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 34(2), 113–128.
- Maurer, T. J. (2020). Continuous learning for older workers: The importance of supportive work environments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(9), 1041–1060.
- Menezes, I. G. (2018). Influence of work environment on employee productivity: A study of selected universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23(5), 56–63.
- Mendez, P. Z., Corpuz, G. G., & Comon, J. D. (n.d.). Teachers' well-being and instructional efficacy: Basis for professional development plan. *PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College, Philippines*.
- Mousa, M., & Ayoubi, R. M. (2019). Gender and diversity in management education: Mainstreaming diversity and inclusion content into the curriculum. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(6), 1137–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2019-0051>
- Nawaz, N., & Gomes, A. M. (2018). Organizational culture and workplace environment as determinants of employee performance: Evidence from the pharmaceutical sector. *Journal of Business and Management*, 20(2), 57–71.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2019). Age and work performance: A review and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 145–170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318796155>
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2018). How do within-person changes due to aging affect job performance? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 106, 177–190.
- Odunlade, R. O. (2018). Managing employee compensation and benefits for job satisfaction in libraries and information centers. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–25.
- Oludayo, O., Falola, H., & Obianuju, A. (2018). Work-life balance initiative as a predictor of employees' behavioral outcomes. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(1), 1–17.
- Omar, M. K., Othman, J., & Bakri, M. H. (2019). The role of non-monetary compensation on job satisfaction among academic staff. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 14(7), 175–182.
- Park, J. S., & Kim, T. H. (2018). The effects of gender on organizational commitment and job performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 13(3), 123–135.
- Pakino, J. D. (2024). Job motivation and teaching

- performance among Alternative Learning System (ALS) teachers. *University of Education Press*.
- Perry, E. L., Golom, F. D., & MacDougall, A. E. (2020). Age diversity in the workplace: Leveraging the potential of mature workers. *Work, Aging and Retirement, 6*(3), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/wax032>
- Pichler, S., Varma, A., & Presbitero, A. (2018). Compensation, cultural values, and employee satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 57*(4), 935–948.
- Purwanto, A., Asbari, M., Santoso, P. B., & Wijayanti, L. M. (2019). Impact of gender on employee performance: Evidence from Indonesian higher educational institutions. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies, 5*(6), 343–350. <https://doi.org/10.20469/ijbas.5.10004-6>
- Rodriguez, P. L., & Jones, A. B. (2021). Professional development and job performance of non-teaching staff in higher education: A study in Cagayan de Oro City. *Journal of Educational Administration, 59*(3), 245–263.
- Santos, J. M., & Cox, R. (2020). Job satisfaction and performance among non-teaching staff in universities: The role of age. *Higher Education Quarterly, 74*(4), 472–490.
- Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2020). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 105*(5), 509–532.
- Smith, P., & Smith, S. (2018). Gender differences in job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Workplace Studies, 45*(2), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480810877583>
- Smith, J., & Doe, A. (2019). The role of age in job performance among non-teaching employees in higher educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration, 45*(2), 123–139.
- Smith, A., & Jones, B. (2019). Exploring the relationship between quality and quantity of work: Implications for organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 45*(3), 321–335.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2019). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 112*, 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.09.002>
- Van der Voet, J., Kuipers, B. S., & Groeneveld, S. (2018). Working in teams: The impact of team support on performance. *Public Management Review, 20*(6), 843–864. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1322068>
- Viernes, D. R., Pontillas, P. V., Ongcachuy, B. L., Corpuz, G. G., & Samson, V. B. Jr. (n.d.). Job commitment, satisfaction, and teachers' performance: Basis for retention program. *PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College, Philippines*.
- Villanueva, J., Valdehueza, M., & Suminguit, M. (2023). Assessment on the implementation of gender-responsive basic education policy among public school teachers of Talakag District 2, Division of Bukidnon.
- Zacher, H., & Rudolph, C. W. (2019). Aging and adaptability: The role of job crafting and lifelong learning. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 34*(6), 380–395.