



WORK PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED DEPED-SUB-OFFICES NON-TEACHING EMPLOYEES: AN INITIATIVE FOR INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING SCHEME

Rellen Karmela C. MERCADO

Laguna State Polytechnic University – Santa Cruz Main Campus, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the work performance of non-teaching staff designated at Department of Education selected sub-offices in the Division of Laguna. The standardized and self-administered questionnaire was distributed via Google Form, and a total of one hundred fifty-five (155) non-teaching staff from various sub-offices took part. The data was analyzed using statistical methods like mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's correlation coefficient as part of the study's descriptive-correlational research design.

The findings indicated that an individual's work characteristics had a significant impact on their work performance, which was rated as extremely high in terms of their adaptive performance, task performance, and contextual performance. However, in counterproductive work behavior assessed very low. It only shows that Department of Education's non-teaching professionals continue to exhibit good work ethics in their respective positions. However, it was shown that there was little correlation between an employee's profile and how well they performed at work.

Furthermore, the study revealed a significant positive relationship between individual work characteristics and work performance. The results imply that employees with very high individual work characteristics tend to have better work performance in their respective institution. Based on the findings, the study recommends that continuous institutional trainings for non-teaching personnel should be conducted regularly to improve their work performance and boost their morale as professionals. This study provides valuable insights for Department of Education for continuous improvement of government services not only in teaching aspect as well as the non-teaching personnel to satisfy clients needs and giving quality education services.

KEYWORDS: *Work Performance, DepEd Sub-Offices, Non-Teaching Employees*

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Education is committed to provide learners with quality basic education that is accessible, inclusive, and liberating through: proactive leadership, shared governance, evidence-based policies, standards and programs, responsive and relevant curricula, highly competent and committed officials, teaching and non-teaching personnel and an enabling environment. By adhering to constitutional mandates, statutory, and regulatory obligations, the Department upholds the highest standards of behavior and performance to meet the demands and expectations of stakeholders. The Department also maintains client satisfaction through ongoing improvement of the Quality Management System (DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2021).

In the majority of education institutions, students often contact with non-teaching staff for both academic and non-academic reasons. Applications, enrollment, registration, problems with exams, problems with accommodations, and the calendar of lectures are only a few of the first steps. The way a staff member performs as an employee is determined by how well they carry out their responsibilities, finish necessary activities, and act in the workplace. The caliber, quantity, and effectiveness of work are all performance indicators. Everyone has different motivations for going to work; some do it for financial gain, some for romantic fulfillment or other forms of personal pleasure, while others do it to accomplish goals and

feel as though they are making a difference to something greater than themselves. It assists staff members in realizing their full potential and enhances overall performance, both of which can boost employee morale and raise the standard of the work generated. Last but not least, and most significantly, when workers perform below satisfactory levels, clients may get unhappy. Thus, poor performance and difficulty achieving goals may have an impact on the entire company.

In Department of Education, all school personnel are also advised to strictly enforce and observe Civil Service Commission laws and DepEd issuances related to teaching and non-teaching related issues and concerns. The merit, competence, suitability, and equality criteria are ones that the Department of Education (DepEd) has made a point of adhering to strictly. The relevant credentials and capability of candidates to carry out the tasks of the post shall be the basis for employee selection.

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive research design was used in this study. Simple random sampling technique to choose one hundred fifty-five (155) non-teaching personnel from three selected Sub Offices of the Department of Education. Standardized self-report questionnaire (Individual Work Performance Scale) and self-made questionnaire with 5 indicators: quality, efficiency, timeliness, accuracy, and interpersonal adaptability. The



Proposal of three research titles, approval of title template, Chapters 1-3 with questionnaire, pre-oral defense, communication letter to Division Office for approval, identification of respondents using sampling technique, gathering of questionnaires, scoring, analyzing, and interpreting data

Percentage and frequency distribution, Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation, One Way ANOVA, Pearson Coefficient Correlation (r)

Overall, this study aims to assess the work performance of non-teaching personnel in selected Sub Offices

of the Department of Education using a descriptive research design and non-experimental research method. The researcher used the simple random sampling technique to choose one hundred fifty-five (155) non-teaching personnel and collect data using a standardized self-report questionnaire and self-made questionnaire. The gathered data will be subjected to statistical analysis using various tools such as Percentage and frequency distribution, Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation, One Way ANOVA and Pearson Coefficient Correlation (r).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Age Distribution of the Employees

AGE RANGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
20 - 30	40	26
31 - 40	58	37
41 - 50	31	20
51 - 60	21	14
61 - 65	5	3
TOTAL	155	100%

Table 1 presents the age distribution of the DEPED selected sub-offices non-teaching employees. As reflected in the table, out of 155 employees were mostly in the range of 31 – 40 years old or 58% of the respondents. And the least frequency of employees was, 61 – 65 years old or 3% of the respondents fall on this age. The results show that most of the respondents belongs to the prime working age (25-54 years old)

group bracket, these are individuals that have the strongest attachment to the labor market. While the least belongs to mature working age (55-64 years old) group bracket, these are older workers are seen as giving a boost to an economy because of their greater work experience.

Table 2. Sex Distribution of the Employees

SEX	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Male	31	20
Female	124	80
TOTAL	155	100%

Table 2 presents the sex distribution of the DEPED selected sub-offices non-teaching employees. As seen in the table, out of 155 employees were mostly in the female or 80% of the respondents. And the rest were male or 20% of the respondents. It's important to note that the reasons for a higher proportion of female employees in the Philippines can be

complex and multifaceted. Additionally, having a higher proportion of female employees does not necessarily mean that an organization or industry is more diverse or equitable, as other factors such as representation in leadership positions and pay equity also play a significant role.

Table 3. Educational Attainment distribution of the Employees

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
College Graduate	104	67
Graduate Studies	51	33
TOTAL	155	100%

Table 3 presents the educational attainment of the DEPED selected sub-offices non-teaching employees. As seen in the table, out of 155 employees were mostly obtained a post-graduate degree or 33% of the respondents. And the rest were college graduate or 67% of the respondents. The demand for

higher education and the benefits it provides, such as improved job prospects, higher earning potential, and opportunities for career advancement, are likely to be key drivers of the high proportion of college graduates and individuals in graduate studies in the Philippines.



Table 4. Years of Service Distribution of the Employees

Years Of Service	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 5 years	81	52
6 – 10 years	22	14
11 – 15 years	23	15
16 – 20 years	26	17
21 years & above	3	2
TOTAL	155	100%

Table 4 presents the length of service of DEPED selected sub-offices non-teaching employees. As seen in the table, out of 155 employees were mostly 1-5 years in service or 52% of the respondents. And the least were 21 years and above in service or 2% of the respondents. DepEd may be expanding its operations or opening new schools, which would require the

hiring of new staff. This could also result in a higher proportion of new hires than employees with more years in service. Having a higher proportion of new hires does not necessarily mean that an organization is more efficient or effective, as the retention and development of experienced employees can also contribute to organizational success.

Table 5. Rank/Position Distribution of the Employees

Rank/Position	Frequency	Percentage
Clerks	14	9
Administrative Assistant	43	28
Administrative Officer	65	42
Head Teacher	17	11
School Head/Principal	11	7
Registrar	5	3
TOTAL	155	100%

Table 5 presents the rank or position of DEPED selected sub-offices non-teaching employees. As seen in the table, out of 155 employees were mostly administrative officers or 42% of the respondents. And the least were registrars or 5% of the respondents. DepEd may have a hierarchical organizational structure that requires administrative officers to

manage and oversee various administrative functions such as finance, human resources, and procurement. That is why higher proportion of administrative officers among non-teaching personnel are the respondents of the study.

Table 6. Income Distribution of the Employees

Monthly Income	Frequency	Percentage
Php 10,000- Php 20, 000	37	24
Php 21,000- Php 30, 000	78	50
Php 31,000- Php 40, 000	28	18
Php 41,000- Php 50, 000	7	5
Php 51,000 above	5	3
TOTAL	155	100%

Table 6 presents the monthly income of DEPED selected sub-offices non-teaching employees. As seen in the table, out of 155 employees were mostly obtain a monthly income of Php 21,000- Php 30, 000 or 50% of the respondents. And the least were Php 51,000 above or 3% of the respondents. It's important to note that the salary range of non-teaching

personnel in DepEd can vary widely depending on the specific position, location, and other factors. Additionally, there may be disparities in salary between different types of non-teaching personnel or between non-teaching and teaching personnel, depending on the organization's budget and staffing needs.

Table 7. Rating of Individual Work Characteristics of the respondents in terms of Quality.

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I substantially do my work and open to feedbacks.	4.70	0.50	Very High
2. I use to maintain high standard of work.	4.52	0.60	Very High
3. I act professionally around everyone.	4.61	0.56	Very High
4. I am very passionate about my work.	4.58	0.58	Very High
5. I am motivated by work-related tasks.	4.62	0.57	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.61	0.04	Very High

Table 7 shows that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching personnel in terms of quality.

The results show that the employees were open and receptive to feedbacks (M= 4.70, SD= 0.50). Meanwhile, the employees



who use to maintain high standard of work ($M=4.52$, $SD= 0.60$) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 4.61 ($SD= 0.04$) indicates that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of quality were interpreted as *Very High*. Striving for a high standard of work can help employees develop new skills, knowledge, and experiences that can benefit their personal and career growth. This can lead to increased job satisfaction, motivation, and confidence, as well

as career advancement opportunities. A study published in the International Journal of Business and Social Science found that setting high standards of work can lead to increased productivity and improved organizational performance. The study found that employees who were given clear performance expectations and feedback were more likely to meet or exceed their goals, leading to improved outcomes for the organization.

Table 8. Rating of Individual Work Characteristics of the respondents in terms of Efficiency.

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I become more productive and inspired in my working environment.	4.50	0.62	Very High
2. I can produce outputs needed during the day.	4.53	0.76	Very High
3. I am motivated to produce more outputs in my workplace.	4.55	0.62	Very High
4. I can help the organization in reaching goals.	4.61	0.62	Very High
5. I know how to prioritize work.	4.63	0.52	Very High
OVERALLTOTAL	4.56	0.08	Very High

Table 8 shows that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching personnel in terms of efficiency. Results shows that the employees know how to prioritize their work ($M=4.63$, $SD= 0.52$). Meanwhile, the employees who become more productive and inspired in their working environment ($M= 4.50$, $SD= 0.62$) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 4.56 ($SD= 0.08$) indicates that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of efficiency were interpreted as *Very High*. When

employees are productive and inspired, they are more likely to take ownership of their work and seek out opportunities for personal and professional growth. Overall, having employees who are productive and inspired in their working environment can lead to a range of positive outcomes for both the employee and the organization. It can result in improved performance, engagement, workplace culture, and personal and professional growth, which can ultimately benefit the bottom line.

Table 9. Rating of Individual Work Characteristics of the respondents in terms of Timeliness

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I could manage to submit reports on time.	4.52	0.66	Very High
2. I always meet the given deadlines.	4.52	0.63	Very High
3. I always have spare time helping colleagues after doing my tasks.	4.42	0.69	Very High
4. I can handle effectively my work even in pressured time.	4.48	0.66	Very High
5. I use to perform well to mobilize collective intelligence for effective team work.	4.54	0.66	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.50	0.04	Very High

Table 9 shows that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching personnel in terms of timeliness. The employees use to perform well to mobilize collective intelligence for effective team work ($M=4.54$, $SD= 0.66$). Meanwhile, the employees that can handle their work effectively even in pressured time ($M=4.48$, $SD= 0.66$) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 4.50 ($SD= 0.04$) indicates that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-

teaching employees in terms of timeliness were interpreted as *Very High*. Employees who are unable to handle their work effectively even in pressured time can negatively impact the organization's bottom line, as well as their own well-being and job satisfaction. It is important for employees to have the skills and resources necessary to manage their workload under pressure in order to ensure that deadlines are met, quality work is produced, and stress and burnout are minimized.

Table 10. Rating of Individual Work Characteristics of the respondents in terms of Accuracy

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I finish needed reports quickly and efficiently.	4.46	0.69	Very High
2. I keep communication with the head and my clients to gather ideas.	4.51	0.59	Very High
3. I have competence to answer any questions regarding my work.	4.42	0.58	Very High
4. I attend to resolve issues appropriately one at a time.	4.43	0.61	Very High
5. I assure that all needed information and documents are understandable and relevant.	4.58	0.53	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.48	0.06	Very High



Table 10 shows that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching personnel in terms of accuracy. The employees assure that all needed information and documents are understandable and relevant (M=4.58, SD= 0.53). Meanwhile, some employees don't have competence to answer any questions regarding their work (M=4.42, SD= 0.58) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 4.48 (SD= 0.06) indicates that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of accuracy were interpreted as *Very High*. Employees may not have received adequate training to understand the details of their work or to answer

questions about it. This can result in a lack of confidence and competence when asked about their job responsibilities. It is important for employees to have the competence to answer questions about their work in order to ensure that they can perform their job responsibilities effectively. However, there may be valid reasons why some employees lack this competence, such as a lack of training, limited experience, job complexity, or poor communication skills. In such cases, it is important for organizations to provide additional support, training, or resources to help employees build the competence they need to succeed in their roles.

Table 11. Rating of Individual Work Characteristics of the respondents in terms of Interpersonal adaptability

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I am open to change and innovation in the workplace.	4.65	0.59	Very High
2. I use to handle conflict and stress in a calm, collected manner.	4.44	0.63	Very High
3. I keep good communication with others effectively.	4.57	0.58	Very High
4. I motivate others to reach our own goals.	4.55	0.58	Very High
5. I can easily interact with my colleagues.	4.54	0.65	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.55	0.03	Very High

Table 11 shows that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching personnel in terms of interpersonal adaptability. The employees are open to change and innovation in the workplace (M=4.65, SD= 0.59). Meanwhile, the employees use to handle conflict and stress in a calm, collected manner (M= 4.44, SD= 0.63) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 4.55 (SD= 0.03) indicates that the rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of interpersonal adaptability were interpreted as *Very High*. Employees may need training on conflict resolution or stress management, leaving them unsure

of how to handle challenging situations in the workplace. Employees who are unable to handle conflict and stress in a calm, collected manner can negatively impact workplace culture and productivity. It is important for organizations to provide training and resources to help employees build the skills and resilience they need to handle challenging situations effectively. This may involve providing conflict resolution training, stress management resources, or creating a supportive work environment that encourages open communication and collaboration.

Table 12. Degree of Employees Work Performance in terms of Task Performance

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I use to complete my assignments on time.	4.50	0.61	Very High
2. I use to maintain high standard of work.	4.52	0.54	Very High
3. I know I can handle multiple assignments for achieving organizational goals.	4.34	0.61	Very High
4. I am very passionate about my work.	4.54	0.63	Very High
5. My colleagues believe I am a high performer in my organization	4.23	0.71	Very High
6. I am capable of handling my assignments without much supervision.	4.54	0.54	Very High
7. I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.	4.46	0.58	Very High
8. I know how to set the right priorities.	4.59	0.53	Very High
9. I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.	4.37	0.65	Very High
10. Collaboration with others was very productive.	4.52	0.58	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.46	0.06	Very High

Table 12 shows the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of task performance. The employees know how to set the right priorities (M=4.59, SD= 0.53). Meanwhile, some employees think that their colleagues perceive them as a high performer in their organization (M= 4.23, SD= 0.71) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 4.46 (SD= 0.06) indicates that the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of task performance were interpreted as *Very High*. An employee's perceived status as a

high performer in their organization can be based on various factors, including feedback from colleagues, recognition and awards, high-quality work output, leadership and team management skills, and subject matter expertise. If an employee believes that their colleagues perceive them as a high performer, this can lead to increased confidence and motivation, as well as potential career opportunities and advancement within the organization.



Table 13. Degree of Employees Work Performance in terms of Adaptive Performance

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I am very comfortable with job flexibility.	4.46	0.54	Very High
2. I could manage change in my job very well whenever the situation demands.	4.32	0.73	Very High
3. I always believe that mutual understanding can lead to a viable solution in organization.	4.60	0.57	Very High
4. I use to lose my temper when faced with criticism from my team members.	2.80	1.41	Moderate
5. I can handle effectively my work team in the face of change.	4.27	0.71	Very High
6. I use to perform well to mobilize collective intelligence for effective team work.	4.31	0.66	Very High
7. I use to cope well with organizational changes from time to time.	4.33	0.67	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.16	0.30	Very High

Table 13 shows the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of adaptive performance. The employees always believe that mutual understanding can lead to a viable solution in organization (M= 4.60, SD= 0.57). Meanwhile, some employees use to lose their temper when faced with criticism from their team members (M= 2.80, SD= 1.41, *Moderate*). The overall score 4.16 (SD= 0.30) indicates that the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of adaptive performance were interpreted as *Very High*. Some employees may lack effective communication skills, making it difficult for them to receive and respond to criticism

in a calm, professional manner. They may not know how to handle criticism constructively or may feel that they are being attacked. Employees who lose their temper in response to criticism can negatively impact team dynamics and productivity. It is important for organizations to provide employees with the necessary training and support to help them develop effective communication skills, handle criticism constructively, and manage their emotions in a professional manner. This may involve providing conflict resolution training, coaching, or creating a supportive work environment that encourages open communication and collaboration.

Table 14. Degree of Employees Work Performance in terms of Contextual Performance

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I love to handle extra responsibilities.	3.90	0.83	High
2. I derive lot of satisfaction nurturing others in organization.	4.27	0.71	Very High
3. I use to share knowledge and ideas among my team members.	4.52	0.58	Very High
4. I actively participate in group discussions and work meetings.	4.31	0.67	Very High
5. I used to extend help to my co-workers when asked or needed.	4.61	0.53	Very High
6. I use to maintain good coordination among fellow workers.	4.55	0.58	Very High
7. I use to praise my co-workers for their good work.	4.55	0.58	Very High
8. I extend my sympathy and empathy to my co-workers when they are in trouble.	4.60	0.58	Very High
9. I use to guide new colleagues beyond my job purview.	4.48	0.57	Very High
10. I communicate effectively with my colleagues for problem solving and decision making.	4.45	0.63	Very High
11. I grasp opportunities when they presented themselves.	4.41	0.65	Very High
12. I know how to solve difficult situations and setbacks quickly.	4.41	0.68	Very High
OVERALL TOTAL	4.46	0.06	Very High

Table 14 shows the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of contextual performance. The employees used to extend help to their co-workers when asked or needed (M= 4.60, SD= 0.53). Meanwhile, some employees don't like to handle extra responsibilities (M=3.90, SD= 0.83, *High*) got lowest mean score. Maybe some employees may already have a heavy workload that they are struggling to manage, which can make it difficult for them to take on additional responsibilities without sacrificing the quality of their work or impacting their personal life. The overall score 4.46 (SD= 0.06) indicates that the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of contextual performance were interpreted as *Very High*. Employees who are unwilling or unable to take on extra

responsibilities can negatively impact organizational goals and productivity. It is important for organizations to identify the reasons why employees may be reluctant to take on additional responsibilities and address these issues to ensure that employees are able to perform at their best. This may involve providing additional training, support, or incentives to encourage employees to take on extra responsibilities, or reassessing workloads and responsibilities to ensure that employees are not overwhelmed.



Table 15. Degree of Employees Work Performance in terms of Counter Productive Work Behavior Performance

Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I complained about minor work-related issues at work.	1.34	0.47	Very Low
2. I made problems at work bigger than they were.	1.21	0.41	Very Low
3. I focused on the negative aspects of situation at work instead of the positive aspects.	1.17	0.38	Very Low
4. I talked to colleagues about the negative aspects of my work.	1.46	0.50	Very Low
5. I talked to people outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work.	1.23	0.42	Very Low
6. I did less than was expected of me.	1.21	0.41	Very Low
7. I managed to get off from a work task easily	3.21	0.57	Very Low
8. I sometimes did nothing, while I should have been working.	1.19	0.45	Very Low
OVERALL TOTAL	1.50	0.06	Very Low

Table 15 shows the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of counterproductive work performance. The employees can manage to get off from a work task easily (M=3.21, SD= 0.57). Meanwhile, employees that focused on the negative aspects of situation at work instead of the positive aspects (M=1.17, SD= 0.38) got the lowest mean score. The overall score 1.50 (SD= 0.06) indicates that the degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of counterproductive work behavior were interpreted as *Very Low*. Understanding the underlying causes of negativity bias can help

organizations and managers develop strategies to help employees shift their focus towards the positive aspects of their work and improve their overall job satisfaction and performance. In organizations that prioritize positivity and optimism, employees may be more likely to focus on the positive aspects of their work. Ultimately, employees should strive to fulfill their responsibilities and commitments to the best of their abilities, and seek support and guidance when needed.

Table 16. Difference on the level of Employees Work Performance in terms of Demographic Profile

Demographic Profile	Employees Work Performance	f value	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Age	Task Performance	2.91	0.72	Accept	Insignificant
	Adaptive Performance				
	Contextual Performance				
	Counter Productive Behavior				
Sex	Task Performance	1.48	0.16	Accept	Insignificant
	Adaptive Performance				
	Contextual Performance				
	Counter Productive Behavior				
Educational Attainment	Task Performance	5.29	0.19	Accept	Insignificant
	Adaptive Performance				
	Contextual Performance				
	Counter Productive Behavior				
Length of Service	Task Performance	7.19	0.52	Accept	Insignificant
	Adaptive Performance				
	Contextual Performance				
	Counter Productive Behavior				
Rank/Position	Task Performance	2.49	0.22	Accept	Insignificant
	Adaptive Performance				
	Contextual Performance				
	Counter Productive Behavior				
Monthly Income	Task Performance	1.89	0.30	Accept	Insignificant
	Adaptive Performance				
	Contextual Performance				
	Counter Productive Behavior				

Table 16 presents the difference in terms of demographic profile with regards to the employees work performance was observed to have an insignificant finding. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were greater than the significance alpha 0.05. From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference on the level of employee work

performance when grouped according to their demographic profile” is accepted. Work performance is a complex and multifaceted construct that encompasses a wide range of behaviors and outcomes, such as productivity, job satisfaction, interpersonal communication, and teamwork. Therefore, it is possible that demographic factors may have different effects on different aspects of work performance, or that the effects of



demographic factors may be difficult to detect due to the complex interplay of various factors that influence work performance. Work performance is influenced by a wide range of individual factors, such as personality traits, cognitive abilities, motivation, and job satisfaction, which may vary widely within demographic groups. Therefore, it is possible that individual differences within demographic groups may be more important determinants of work performance than demographic factors themselves. Even if there are statistically significant

differences in work performance across different demographic groups, the effect sizes may be small or not practically significant. Therefore, it may not be meaningful or useful to group employees according to their demographic profile when assessing work performance. Ultimately, it is important for organizations to focus on promoting a culture of fairness, equal opportunities, and support for all employees, regardless of their demographic characteristics.

Table 17. Relationship between Individual Work Characteristics and the degree of the employees work performance.

Work Characteristic	Degree of Work Performance	Computed R	Strength of Correlation	p value	Analysis
Quality	Task Performance	0.626	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Contextual	0.629	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Adaptive Performance	0.787	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Counter Productive Behavior	-0.310	Low Negative	< .001	Significant
Timeliness	Task Performance	0.870	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Contextual	0.771	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Adaptive Performance	0.851	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Counter Productive Behavior	-0.152	Negligible	< .001	Significant
Efficiency	Task Performance	0.860	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Contextual Performance	0.716	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Adaptive Performance	0.848	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Counter Productive Behavior	-0.238	Low Negative	0.003	Significant
Accuracy	Task Performance	0.914	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Contextual Performance	0.780	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Adaptive Performance	0.874	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Counter Productive Behavior	-0.197	Low Negative	< .001	Significant
Interpersonal Adaptability	Task Performance	0.878	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Contextual Performance	0.699	Moderately High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Adaptive Performance	0.872	High Positive	< .001	Significant
	Counter Productive Behavior	-0.207	Low Negative	< .001	Significant

Table 17 presents the relationship between individual work characteristics and the degree of the employees work performance. It was found that there was a correlation between these variables. Based on estimated r values from statistical test with significant relationship that ranges from low positive to high positive correlations. There is a significant result since the p-values obtained were lower than the significance alpha 0.05. From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between individual work characteristics and the degree of the employees work performance” is rejected. Thus, the alternative hypothesis should be accepted which incites that there is a significant relationship between them. Individual work characteristics can also be influenced by the work environment, such as the culture of the organization, the level of support provided by supervisors and colleagues, and the availability of resources and training. Employees who work in a positive and supportive environment are more likely to exhibit positive work characteristics and perform at a higher level than those who work in a less supportive environment. There is a significant relationship between individual work characteristics and the degree of employees' work performance. Motivation, skills and abilities, personality traits, and work environment all play a critical role in shaping individual work characteristics and influencing work performance. Organizations can leverage this knowledge to design work environments and policies that

promote positive work characteristics and maximize work performance.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings showed that most of the respondents belongs to the prime working age (25-54 years old) group bracket, these are individuals that have the strongest attachment to the labor market. Most of the respondents shows a higher proportion of female employees. The demand for higher education and the benefits it provides, such as improved job prospects, higher earning potential, and opportunities for career advancement, are likely to be key drivers of the high proportion of college graduates and individuals in graduate studies in the Philippines. DepEd may be expanding its operations or opening new schools, which would require the hiring of new staff. This could also result in a higher proportion of new hires than employees with more years in service. DepEd may have a hierarchical organizational structure that requires administrative officers to manage and oversee various administrative functions such as finance, human resources, and procurement. That is why higher proportion of administrative officers among non-teaching personnel are the respondents of the study.

The rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of quality were interpreted as Very High, but some employees having difficulties in maintaining high standard of work. The rating of individual work



characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of efficiency were interpreted as Very High, but some employees are having difficulties on being more productive and inspired of their working environment. The rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of timeliness were interpreted as Very High, but some employees can't handle their work effectively in pressured time. The rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of accuracy were interpreted as Very High but some employees don't have competence to answer any questions regarding their work. The rating of individual work characteristics of non-teaching employees in terms of interpersonal adaptability were interpreted as Very High, but some employees are not use to handle conflict and stress in a calm, collected manner.

The degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of task performance were interpreted as Very High, but some employees think that their colleagues perceive them as a high performer in their organization. The degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of adaptive performance were interpreted as Very High, but some employees use to lose their temper when faced with criticism from their team members. The degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of contextual performance were interpreted as Very High but some employees don't like to handle extra responsibilities. The degree of non-teaching personnel work performance in terms of counterproductive work behavior were interpreted as Very Low, but some employees focused on the negative aspects of situation at work instead of the positive aspects.

There is no significant difference between profile and the degree of the employees work performance. Thus, null hypothesis is accepted. There is significant relationship between individual work characteristics and the degree of the employees work performance. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of conclusions drawn from the findings, the recommendations of the study were intervention to Institutional trainings with regards to professional growth development of non-teaching personnel was needed to improve individual work characteristics as directly showed in this study that it really affects individual work performance and to solve the areas that needed to address for continuous productivity and positive development of DepEd employees' services;

Future researchers may suggest other institutional trainings and activities concerning career build up for continuous professional development of non-teaching personnel in Department of Education; and

Department of Education may adapt suggested trainings on the foreseen weakness of non-teaching personnel as reflected in this study for example on why some employees can't handle extra responsibilities and why some employees use to lose their temper when faced with criticism from their team members. These are just examples of situations that may need to be addressed immediately.

REFERENCES

1. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet Henrica, C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). *Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance*. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53, 856-866. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
2. Locke, E. (1976), "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction, in *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* Edited by M.D. Dunnette (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), pp. 901-969.
3. Nash, M. (2015), "Managing Organizational Performance", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, California.
4. Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2020). *Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 612-624. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612>
5. Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2012). *The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 66-80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66>