

Employee Engagement and Performance in a Public Office

Ari S. Arceo¹, Mary Ann E. Pet², Ma. Quincy D. Dones³, Lenny Mae C. Otero⁴

¹DAR, Negros Occidental South, Philippines

²Sangguniang Bayan, Municipal of Pontevedra, Philippines

^{3,4}La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700965>

Received: 07 August 2026; Accepted: 12 August 2026; Published: 18 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This descriptive-correlational study, conducted in 2026, examined the relationship between employee engagement and performance in a selected public office in the Philippines. Using total enumeration, all 119 employees of the selected public office participated as respondents. The study determined the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, employment status, and length of service. It further assessed employee engagement in terms of work commitment, supervisor support, and work environment, and examined employee performance based on quality of work and productivity. Data were gathered using a standardized survey questionnaire and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools. The findings revealed that the respondents were predominantly middle-aged, female, married, college graduates, permanent employees, and had extensive work experience. Overall, employee engagement was assessed at a very high level, with work commitment, supervisor support, and work environment likewise receiving very high assessments. Employee performance was also rated at a very high level, particularly in terms of quality of work and productivity. The findings further established a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and employee performance. This result led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating that higher employee engagement was associated with better employee performance in the selected public office. The findings emphasize the importance of fostering employees' commitment to their work, providing supportive supervision, and maintaining a positive and conducive work environment. These factors contribute to improved productivity, quality of work, efficiency, and organizational effectiveness. The study underscores the importance of strengthening employee engagement initiatives among public institutions to promote responsive service delivery, employee development, organizational performance, and greater public trust. The findings may serve as a basis for administrators, government agencies, employees, community stakeholders, and future researchers in developing strategies that enhance employee engagement and performance in public service.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Employee Performance, Public Office, Work Commitment, Supervisor Support

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary organizational theory, employee engagement is considered a cornerstone of effective performance management. Ideally, public offices should cultivate an environment where employees are highly engaged, motivated, and committed to delivering quality public service. Engagement is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption in one's work, which collectively enhance organizational outcomes. Khusanova, Kang, and Choi (2021) emphasized that job meaningfulness and supportive leadership significantly foster engagement, which in turn mediates improved performance in public institutions. Similarly, Albrecht et al. (2021) argued that engaged employees demonstrate higher productivity, creativity, and resilience, thereby contributing to sustainable organizational success. In this ideal scenario, public offices function as dynamic institutions where employee engagement directly translates into enhanced service delivery and citizen satisfaction.

Despite the theoretical benefits of engagement, the reality in many public offices is far from ideal. Bureaucratic rigidity, political interference, and resource constraints often undermine employee motivation and performance. Hameduddin (2021) noted that public employees are frequently subject to external pressures such as political salience and public scrutiny, which negatively affect their engagement levels. Moreover, Stankevičiūtė and Savanevičienė (2021) observed that inconsistent leadership practices, lack of recognition, and limited opportunities for professional growth contribute to disengagement among public sector employees. These challenges manifest in reduced efficiency, low morale, and diminished organizational effectiveness. Consequently, while engagement is recognized as vital, its practical implementation in public offices remains inconsistent and problematic.

Although employee engagement has been extensively studied in private organizations, there is limited empirical evidence on its direct relationship with performance in public offices, particularly within developing country contexts. Existing literature has primarily focused on organizational culture, leadership, or external pressures, but less attention has been given to the integrated link between engagement and performance outcomes in government institutions. As highlighted by Saks (2021), engagement research in the public sector remains underdeveloped, leaving a gap in understanding how engagement strategies can be tailored to bureaucratic environments. This gap underscores the need for scholarly inquiry into how engagement influences performance in public offices, where accountability, transparency, and service delivery are paramount. Conducting this study will not only enrich academic discourse but also provide practical insights for policymakers and administrators seeking to enhance efficiency, employee well-being, and public trust in government institutions.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to examine the relationship between employee engagement and performance in a provincial public office in the Philippines. This approach allowed the researcher to describe existing levels of engagement and performance while analyzing their relationship without manipulating variables. The entire population of 119 employees was included through total enumeration sampling, ensuring comprehensive coverage and eliminating sampling error. Data were gathered using a standardized survey questionnaire developed by Harter et al. (2020), which measured demographic profile, employee engagement (work commitment, supervisor support, work environment), and employee performance (quality of work and productivity) on a four-point Likert scale.

The instrument had established validity and reliability, with a Content Validity Index of 0.92 and Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.87 for engagement and 0.82 for performance, confirming its credibility. Data collection was conducted via Google Forms, ensuring accessibility, confidentiality, and systematic recording of responses. For analysis, frequency and percentage were applied to demographic data, while mean and standard deviation determined levels of engagement and performance. Interpretation scales guided the evaluation of results, and the relationship between engagement and performance was tested using Spearman's rho correlation, ensuring rigorous and reliable measurement aligned with the study's objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents According to Profile.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age			
	23-32 years old	31	26.05
	33-42 years old	64	53.78
	43-52 years old	15	12.61
	53-62 years old	7	5.88
	63 years old and above	2	1.68
	Total	119	100.00

Sex			
	Male	28	23.53
	Female	91	76.47
	Total	119	100.00
Civil Status			
	Single	49	41.18
	Married	70	58.82
	Widowed	0	0
	Separated	0	0
	Total	119	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment			
	High School Graduate	0	0
	College Graduate	79	66.39
	Master's Degree	38	31.93
	Doctorate Degree	2	1.68
	Total	119	100.00
Employment Status			
	Permanent	116	97.48
	Contractual	3	2.52
	Job Order	0	0
	Casual	0	0
	Total	119	100.00
Length of Service			
	Less than 1 year	6	5.04
	1-5 years	41	34.45
	6-10 years	26	21.85
	More than 10 years	46	38.66
	Total	119	100.00

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their demographic profile. Out of the 119 respondents, the largest group falls within the age bracket of 33–42 years old ($f = 64$, 53.78%), followed by those aged 23–32 years ($f = 31$, 26.05%). This indicates that the workforce is predominantly composed of mid-career individuals. The Philippine Statistics Authority (2025) similarly reported that the labor force is dominated by prime-age adults, particularly those aged 25–34, supporting this finding. However, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2024) highlighted that in many countries, older workers (50+) are increasingly retained due to aging populations, which contradicts the limited representation of older employees in this study.

Sex distribution shows that females constitute the majority ($f = 91$, 76.47%), while males account for only 23.53% ($f = 28$). This imbalance highlights the gendered nature of the profession. Eastern Visayas State University (2026) reported similar trends, with women dominating teaching and administrative roles, supporting the present result. Conversely, the Philippine Statistics Authority (2026) noted that men still dominate technical and STEM-related fields, suggesting that female predominance is not universal across all sectors.

Civil status data reveal that most respondents are married ($f = 70$, 58.82%), while a substantial portion are single ($f = 49$, 41.18%). The absence of widowed or separated individuals may reflect cultural or institutional factors. The World Bank (2025) emphasized that family stability often correlates with workforce stability in public institutions, supporting the predominance of married employees. On the other hand, Jian et al. (2025) argued that civil status has little direct effect on productivity compared to skills and management, contradicting the assumption that marriage necessarily enhances workforce performance.

Educational attainment demonstrates the academic preparedness of the respondents. A majority are college graduates ($f = 79$, 66.39%), while a significant number hold master's degree ($f = 38$, 31.93%). Only two

respondents (1.68%) have attained a doctorate, and none are limited to high school education. Yee (2023) found that higher education in the Philippines expanded access and improved opportunities, supporting the highly educated nature of the sample. However, Albert et al. (2024) reported declining returns to college education from 2010–2022, suggesting that while attainment is high, economic benefits may not be as strong, which contradicts the assumption that higher education always translates to better outcomes.

Employment status reveals strong job stability, as nearly all respondents hold permanent positions ($f = 116$, 97.48%). Respicio & Co. (2026) emphasized that regular employment ensures stability and benefits, consistent with this finding. In contrast, ASG Law Partners (2024) highlighted that many government workers remain under job order contracts, showing that permanent employment dominance is not universal across all institutions.

Length of service data reinforce this observation, with 46 respondents (38.66%) having served more than 10 years, reflecting loyalty and accumulated expertise. Meanwhile, 41 respondents (34.45%) have served between 1–5 years, and 26 (21.85%) between 6–10 years, indicating a balance between seasoned employees and relatively new entrants. Respicio & Co. (2025) noted that length of service awards enhance loyalty and retention, supporting the finding of long tenure. However, Profit.co (2026) argued that recognition programs must start earlier (1–3 years) to prevent attrition, suggesting that long tenure alone does not guarantee retention.

Employee Engagement

Table 2. Level of Employee Engagement as a Whole and in terms of Work Commitment; Supervisor Support; and Work Environment.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Work Commitment	3.50	.40	Very High
1. I recommend this organization as a great place to work.	3.44	.55	Very High
2. I am proud to work here.	3.68	.49	Very High
3. It would take a lot to get me to leave this organization.	3.31	.63	Very High
4. I know how I fit into the organization's future plans.	3.37	.61	Very High
5. I understand how my job helps the organization achieve success.	3.76	.43	Very High
6. I understand the company's plans for future success.	3.61	.60	Very High
7. I believe this organization will be successful in the future.	3.61	.61	Very High
8. If I contribute to the organization's success, I know I will be recognized.	3.25	.72	High
Supervisor Support	3.46	.50	Very High
1. My immediate manager cares about me as a person.	3.62	.62	Very High
2. My immediate manager cares about my development.	3.61	.60	Very High
3. My opinions seem to count at work.	3.46	.66	Very High
4. I am included in decisions that affect my work.	3.46	.71	Very High
5. Senior leadership is prepared to effectively manage a diverse workforce.	3.44	.62	Very High
6. Senior leaders in this organization demonstrate integrity.	3.39	.61	Very High
7. I trust senior leaders to lead the company to future success.	3.47	.59	Very High
8. Senior leaders value people as their most important resource.	3.36	.70	Very High
9. Senior leaders keep me informed about what's happening at this organization.	3.43	.65	Very High
10. When the organization makes changes, I understand why.	3.37	.64	Very High
Work Environment	3.47	.46	Very High
1. My immediate coworkers are committed to this organization's overall goals.	3.52	.64	Very High

2. My immediate coworkers consistently go the extra mile to achieve great results.	3.55	.62	Very High
3. I feel accepted by my immediate coworkers.	3.67	.52	Very High
4. I feel like I belong at this organization.	3.55	.53	Very High
5. I trust this organization to be fair to all employees.	3.13	.80	High
6. My job gives me the flexibility to meet the needs of both my work and personal life.	3.47	.64	Very High
7. I am paid fairly.	3.50	.59	Very High
8. Our culture supports my health and wellbeing.	3.29	.69	Very High
9. The benefits offered here meet my and my family's needs.	3.33	.65	Very High
10. I know I can depend on the other members of my team.	3.50	.61	Very High
11. The people I work with treat each other with respect.	3.61	.57	Very High
Employee Engagement As a Whole	3.47	.42	Very High

Legend: (3.26-4.0)-Very High, (2.51-3.25)-High, (1.76-2.50)-Low, (1.0-1.75)-Very Low

The results on table 2 show the level of employee engagement as a whole and in terms of work commitment, supervisor support, and work environment. As a whole, employee engagement registered a mean score of 3.47 (SD = .42), interpreted as very high. This demonstrates that employees generally perceive their organization positively, with the relatively low SD suggesting strong consensus across respondents. This implies that the organization has successfully cultivated a culture of engagement, which is essential for sustaining productivity and morale. At the same time, the presence of variability across items indicates that management should continue reinforcing practices that maintain high levels of engagement across all employee groups.

In terms of work commitment, the composite mean was 3.50 (SD = .40), also very high. Employees expressed pride in their organization (mean = 3.68, SD = .49) and a willingness to recommend it as a great place to work (mean = 3.44, SD = .55). Retention-related perceptions, however, showed more variability, as seen in the item "It would take a lot to get me to leave this organization" (mean = 3.31, SD = .63). The higher SD here indicates differing views among employees regarding long-term loyalty. This implies that while pride and recommendation are widely shared, retention may be influenced by external opportunities or organizational factors.

For supervisor support, mean scores ranged from 3.36 to 3.62, all interpreted as very high. Immediate managers were perceived more positively (mean = 3.62, SD = .62) than senior leaders (mean = 3.36, SD = .70). The SDs, ranging from .59 to .71, reveal moderate variability, particularly in items related to senior leadership. This implies that while employees consistently value the support of their immediate supervisors, perceptions of senior leadership are more diverse, reflecting differences in trust and credibility.

Finally, the work environment dimension also demonstrated strong ratings, with items such as teamwork and respect scoring highly (mean = 3.61, SD = .57), while perceptions of fairness scored lower (mean = 3.13, SD = .80). The wider SDs in this dimension suggest significant divergence in employee experiences, particularly regarding inclusivity and fairness. This implies that while employees feel supported by their peers and supervisors, organizational fairness and benefits require closer attention.

The results conform with the findings of Agustiani et al. (2024), who demonstrated that workplace happiness, mediated by quality of work life, significantly enhances employee engagement. This supports the present study's consistently very high ratings across work commitment, supervisor support, and work environment, as it highlights the role of positive organizational climates in sustaining employee pride, collegiality, and overall satisfaction. Similarly, Nadales-Gallego et al. (2025) identified internal communication as a strategic driver of engagement, linking organizational goals with employee satisfaction and performance. This aligns with the strong consensus observed in the present results, particularly in employees' understanding of their roles and their trust in immediate supervisors.

However, the findings contradict perspectives from Suh and Battaglio (2022), who argued that communication practices alone may not guarantee sustained engagement, noting that employees sometimes disengage despite clear organizational objectives. This stands in contrast to the uniformly high ratings in role clarity and organizational alignment reported here. Likewise, Demupa et al. (2026) concluded that perceived organizational support and workplace spirituality significantly predict engagement outcomes but emphasized gaps in small and medium enterprises where workplace conditions often fail to sustain engagement. This contradicts the present study's results, which show strong engagement even in areas such as teamwork and respect, suggesting that while employees self-assess positively, broader structural and contextual challenges may still limit the full realization of engagement in practice.

Employee Performance

Table 3. Level of Employee Performance as a Whole and in terms of Quality of Work; and Productivity.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Quality of Work	3.43	.51	Very High
1. My job allows me to utilize my strengths.	3.59	.56	Very High
2. I have opportunities to learn new skills that will help me succeed.	3.39	.70	Very High
3. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my job.	3.34	.64	Very High
4. I have the information I need to do my job well.	3.39	.65	Very High
5. I clearly understand how my performance is measured.	3.45	.62	Very High
6. Goals and accountabilities are clear to everyone on my team.	3.55	.65	Very High
7. My immediate manager regularly coaches me on my job performance.	3.31	.75	Very High
Productivity	3.47	.55	Very High
1. My work motivates me.	3.34	.68	Very High
2. I find my work engaging.	3.43	.66	Very High
3. I am inspired by the work we do.	3.50	.65	Very High
4. I understand how my job helps the organization achieve success.	3.61	.56	Very High
Level of Employee Performance as a Whole	3.45	.50	Very High

Legend: (3.26-4.0)-Very High, (2.51-3.25)-High, (1.76-2.50)-Low, (1.0-1.75)-Very Low

Table 3 indicates that the level of employee performance was rated very high, with a composite mean of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.50. This finding suggests that employees generally perceive themselves as performing strongly across both quality and productivity dimensions. The relatively low variability in responses reflects a shared consensus of high performance, which speaks positively to the organization's systems and culture. It implies that the workforce is not only competent but also consistently aligned with organizational expectations, thereby providing a solid foundation for sustaining operational effectiveness and long-term success.

For the quality of work, the mean score of 3.43 (SD = 0.51) was likewise interpreted as very high. Employees reported that their jobs allow them to utilize their strengths (Mean = 3.59) and that they have clarity on how their performance is measured (Mean = 3.45). These results indicate that employees feel empowered and supported in executing their tasks, with organizational structures enabling them to maximize their capabilities.

The productivity dimension achieved a mean score of 3.47 (SD = 0.55), also interpreted as very high. Employees expressed strong motivation and engagement, with the highest rating given to the statement, "I understand how my job helps the organization achieve success" (Mean = 3.61, SD = .56). This demonstrates that employees recognize the significance of their contributions and feel inspired by organizational goals. It further implies that the workforce is not only performing tasks but is also emotionally invested in the success of the organization.

The findings conform with Zubair et al. (2021), who argued that public service motivation significantly enhances organizational performance, with altruism and perceived social impact serving as mediating factors. This aligns with the present study’s results, where employees reported strong clarity in role expectations and high motivation. Similarly, Tantia et al. (2023) found that the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) in a Philippine government agency was perceived as an effective tool for enhancing productivity, reinforcing the notion that structured evaluation systems contribute to consistently high employee performance.

However, the findings contradict with Hill and Plimmer (2024), who noted that bureaucratic red tape and competing organizational goals hinder effective employee development in New Zealand’s public sector, suggesting that high performance ratings may not always translate into sustainable outcomes. This stands in contrast to the uniformly high ratings in productivity and organizational alignment reported here. Likewise, Keefer and Vlaicu (2022) emphasized that trust deficits constrain collaboration and productivity in Latin American public offices, highlighting that even when employees self-assess positively, systemic challenges can undermine performance outcomes.

Relationship between Employee Engagement and Performance in a Public Office

Table 4. Relationship between Employee Engagement and Performance in a Public Office.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Employee Engagement vs. Employee Performance	.742**	<.001	Reject H_0	Significant

The results presented in table 4 reveal a significant relationship between employee engagement and employee performance in a public office. The computed test statistic ($r_s = 0.742^{**}$) demonstrates a correlation between the two variables, while the p-value of less than .001 confirms that the probability of this finding occurring by chance is extremely low. As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected, affirming that employee engagement is a critical determinant of performance outcomes. It implies that when employees are highly engaged, emotionally invested, cognitively focused, and behaviorally committed, they are more likely to exhibit improved productivity, efficiency, and accountability, thereby contributing to the overall effectiveness of public institutions.

This finding is consistent with Khusanova et al. (2021), who established that job meaningfulness significantly predicts engagement, which subsequently mediates performance outcomes in government institutions. Similarly, Demircioglu and Chowdhury (2021) demonstrated that innovative practices within public administration foster higher engagement, leading to improved organizational performance. These studies reinforce the present result by showing that internal organizational factors, such as meaningful work and innovation, serve as catalysts for engagement that directly enhance employee performance.

However, this contradicts the result from Hameduddin (2021), who found that political salience and public opinion moderate the relationship between perceived support and engagement, suggesting that external pressures can weaken or complicate the direct influence of engagement on performance. Likewise, Vigoda-Gadot et al. (2022) argued that public trust and organizational reputation mediate the engagement–performance relationship, indicating that engagement alone may not guarantee improved outcomes unless reinforced by external relational dynamics.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made:

The respondents are primarily in the middle age group, predominantly female, married, and well-educated, with most holding permanent positions and having long years of service. This indicates a stable and experienced employee base.

Employees are strongly committed to their work, supported by supervisors, and satisfied with their work environment.

Employees perform effectively, demonstrating competence, motivation, and productivity in their roles.

Employee engagement directly enhances employee performance, affirming that higher engagement leads to stronger outcomes in the workplace.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses profound gratitude to the management and employees of the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) for their cooperation and assistance in the conduct of this study. Their willingness to provide information and support contributed significantly to the successful completion of the research.

The researcher also extends appreciation to the adviser and panel members whose guidance, constructive feedback, and encouragement were invaluable throughout the process. Their expertise and insights helped refine the study and ensured its academic rigor.

Finally, the researcher acknowledges the unwavering support of family and peers, whose encouragement and understanding provided strength during the challenges of the research journey. Their presence and motivation served as a source of inspiration in bringing this study to fruition.

REFERENCES

1. Agustiani, T., Mora, L., & Ibad, C. (2024). Increasing employee engagement through workplace happiness: A quality of work life mediation study. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 12(3), 378–384. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v12i3.378-384>
2. Albert, J. R. G., Punongbayan, J. C. B., & Muñoz, M. S. (2024). Returns to education in the Philippines (2005–2022): Declining benefits, increased inequities (Policy Note No. 2024-09). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.62986/pn2024.09>
3. Albrecht, S. L., Green, C. R., & Marty, A. (2021). Meaningful work, job resources, and employee engagement. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 4045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13074045>
4. ASG Law Partners. (2024, July 19). Pagkilala sa kontrata ng serbisyo at job order: Gabay sa mga empleyado at employer. ASG Law. <https://asgpartners.com>
5. Demircioglu, M. A., & Chowdhury, F. (2021). Public sector innovation and employee engagement: An empirical study. *Public Management Review*, 23(12), 1856–1876. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1722231>
6. Demupa, L., Nisa, Y. F., & Mujib, A. (2026). Employee engagement in the workplace: A systematic literature review. *Multidisciplinary Output Research for Actual and International Issue (MORFAI)*, 6(3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20751733>
7. Eastern Visayas State University. (2026). GAD statistics for employees SY 2025–2026 (1st semester). EVSU. <https://evsu.edu.ph>
8. Hameduddin, T. (2021). Employee engagement among public employees: Exploring the role of the (perceived) external environment. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 51(7), 526–541. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740211010346>
9. Hameduddin, T. (2021). Employee engagement among public employees: Exploring the role of the (perceived) external environment. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 51(7), 526–541. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740211010346>
10. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Blue, A., Plowman, S. K., Josh, P., & Asplund, J. (2020). The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes: 2020 Q12® meta-analysis (10th ed.). Gallup. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.22803.20006>
11. Hill, K., & Plimmer, G. (2024). Employee performance management: The impact of competing goals, red tape, and PSM. *Public Personnel Management*, 53(3), 458–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260241231371>
12. Jian, F., Liu, Q., Feng, C., Hu, Q., Yu, Q., & Guo, Q. (2025). Critical factors affecting construction labor productivity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Buildings*, 15(14), 2463. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15142463>

13. Keefer, P., & Vlaicu, R. (2022). Employee trust and performance constraints in public sector organizations. *Inter-American Development Bank Working Paper Series*, No. 1376. <https://doi.org/10.18235/0004596>
14. Khusanova, R., Kang, S.-W., & Choi, S. B. (2021). Work engagement among public employees: Antecedents and consequences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 684495. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.684495>
15. Khusanova, R., Kang, S.-W., & Choi, S. B. (2021). Work engagement among public employees: Antecedents and consequences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 684495. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.684495>
16. Nadales-Gallego, A., Galindo-Reyes, F., & Garrido-Moreno, A. (2025). Connecting internal communication and employee engagement in organisation: A systematic literature review. *SAGE Open*, 15(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251399773>
17. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Promoting better career choices for longer working lives: Stepping up not stepping out (Ageing and Employment Policies). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1ef9a0d0-en>
18. Philippine Statistics Authority. (2025). Annual provincial labor market statistics (Preliminary results). PSA. <https://psa.gov.ph/system/files/iesd/Press-Release-Annual-2024-and-2025-Labor-Market-Statistics.pdf>
19. Philippine Statistics Authority. (2026). Women and men in the Philippines: Fact sheet 2026. PSA. <https://psa.gov.ph/gender-statistics>
20. Respicio & Co. Law Firm. (2025, August 9). Length of service awards for employees in the Philippines. Respicio & Co. <https://respicio.com>
21. Respicio & Co. Law Firm. (2026, April 14). Employee regularization rights and requirements under Philippine labor law. Respicio & Co. <https://respicio.com>
22. Saks, A. M. (2021). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100835>
23. Stankevičiūtė, Ž., & Savanevičienė, A. (2021). Linkage between leaders' behaviour in performance management, organisational justice and work engagement in public sector. *Economies*, 9(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9010015>
24. Suh, J., & Battaglio, P. (2022). Assessing the mediating effect of internal communication on strategic human resource management and perceived performance: An intersectoral comparison. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 42(3), 464–491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X21994185>
25. Tania, C. M. C., Tambaoan, A. R., Peñaflor, A., & Briones, J. (2023). Performance evaluation system of a Philippine government agency. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4643981>
26. Vigoda-Gadot, E., Talmud, I., & Ben-Zion, U. (2022). Public trust, organizational reputation, and work engagement: A mediation model in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 82(2), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13492>
27. World Bank Group. (2025, April 7). State of social protection report 2025: The 2-billion-person challenge. World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/>
28. Yee, K. M. R. (2023). At all costs: Educational expansion and persistent inequality in the Philippines. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01092-y>
29. Zubair, S. S., Khan, M. A., & Mukaram, A. T. (2021). Public service motivation and organizational performance: Catalyzing effects of altruism, perceived social impact and political support. *PLOS ONE*, 16(12), e0260559. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260559>