

Work Engagement, Productivity, and Professional Development of Employees

Relyn B. Jungco¹, Nelson G. Bedaure², Ma. Quincy D. Dones³

¹DAR, Negros Occidental North, Philippines

²Department of Education, Division of Negros Occidental, Philippines

³La Carlota City College

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800785>

Received: 02 September 2026; Accepted: 07 September 2026; Published: 17 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined work engagement, productivity, and professional development and growth among employees in one of the public offices in Negros Island Region in 2026. Specifically, it determined the respondents' profile according to section, sex, and age; assessed their levels of work engagement in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption, productivity, and professional development and growth; tested differences in work engagement and productivity according to profile variables; and examined the relationships of work engagement and productivity with professional development and growth. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design involving 100 employees selected from different organizational sections. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Findings revealed a high level of work engagement, with dedication obtaining the highest mean among its dimensions. Productivity and professional development and growth were likewise high. Work engagement and productivity did not significantly differ according to section, sex, or age. Moreover, work engagement had a weak positive but non-significant relationship with professional development and growth, while productivity had a negligible positive and non-significant relationship with professional development and growth. The study concluded that favorable employee engagement and productivity existed across demographic groups, while professional growth required deliberate organizational support. The findings provided an empirical basis for a developmental plan intended to sustain employee engagement and productivity and strengthen professional development initiatives.

Keywords: Work Engagement, Productivity, Professional Development, Employees

INTRODUCTION

A high-quality workforce is an important organizational investment that contributes to effective service delivery and long-term organizational development. Professional development and growth involve the continuous acquisition of knowledge, skills, competencies, and attitudes that enable employees to improve their capabilities and advance professionally. Opportunities for training, upskilling, seminars, workshops, and advanced studies may promote personal growth, career advancement, and improved workplace performance (Nhlumayo & Mabeleng, 2025; Shiri et al., 2023). Studies have shown that professional development opportunities can strengthen employees' capabilities, professional learning, and career growth across different organizational settings (Badaruddin et al., 2024; Romorosa & Uchang, 2025). These opportunities are particularly important because employees must continuously adapt to changing workplace requirements and apply newly acquired knowledge and skills to their professional responsibilities.

Despite the recognized importance of professional development and growth, limited attention has been given to its relationship with both work engagement and productivity, particularly among employees in public-sector workplaces. Work engagement, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption, reflects how employees' approach and become involved in their work, while productivity concerns their ability to accomplish

responsibilities and produce quality outputs efficiently. Although previous studies have examined professional development in various occupational settings, empirical evidence involving employees in public offices in the Negros Island Region remains limited. Therefore, this study examined the work engagement, productivity, and professional development and growth of employees in one of the public offices in the Negros Island Region. Specifically, it assessed these variables and determined their relationships. The findings may provide a basis for strengthening employee engagement, productivity, and opportunities for continuous professional development and growth in the public-sector workplace.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive-correlational design to examine relationships among work engagement, productivity, and professional development. The study involved 100 respondents from the Support to Operations Division (STOD) in Negros Island Region, drawn from a total population of 113 employees. A total population sampling technique was applied, ensuring all eligible employees were invited to participate. Data were gathered using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale and a customized questionnaire measuring productivity and professional development, with responses rated on a 5-point Likert scale. To ensure rigor, the instrument underwent content validity testing using Lawshe's CVR with six expert validators, all items achieving a CVR of 1.00. Reliability was confirmed through a pilot test, yielding Cronbach's alpha coefficients above .90, indicating excellent internal consistency.

For data collection, consent letters were secured from office heads, and surveys were administered both in person and via Google Forms. Respondents signed consent forms to guarantee confidentiality. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation to profile respondents and measure levels of engagement, productivity, and professional development. Non-parametric tests including the Mann-Whitney Test and Kruskal-Wallis H were used to determine differences across demographic groups, while Spearman's rho assessed correlations between work engagement, productivity, and professional development. Interpretation guides were provided for each variable, ensuring clarity in categorizing responses from very low to very high levels. This methodology ensured that the study's objectives were addressed through systematic, valid, and reliable procedures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

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

Profile	Category	f	%
Section			
	Chief Administrative Officer's Office	4	4
	Personnel	13	13
	General Services	23	23
	Records	10	10
	Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PMEU)	10	10
	Accounting	17	17
	Budget	11	11
	Cash	6	6

	Public Assistance and Complaints Coordination Unit (PACCU)	3	3
	Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee (PARCCOM) or Special Concern	1	1
	Commission on Audit (COA)	2	2
	Total	100	100
Sex			
	Male	24	24
	Female	76	76
	Total	100	100
Age			
	25 years old and below	9	9
	26–35 years old	63	63
	36–45 years old	22	22
	46 years old and up	6	6
	Total	100	100.00

Table 1 shows that the respondents were distributed across 11 sections, with the largest proportion coming from General Services ($f = 23$; $\% = 23$), followed by Accounting ($f = 17$; $\% = 17$), Personnel ($f = 13$; $\% = 13$), Budget ($f = 11$; $\% = 11$), Records ($f = 10$; $\% = 10$), and the Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit ($f = 10$; $\% = 10$). Smaller proportions came from Cash ($f = 6$; $\% = 6$), the Chief Administrative Officer's Office ($f = 4$; $\% = 4$), the Public Assistance and Complaints Coordination Unit ($f = 3$; $\% = 3$), the Commission on Audit ($f = 2$; $\% = 2$), and the Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee ($f = 1$; $\% = 1$). The findings indicate that the workforce was concentrated in sections responsible for administrative, logistical, financial, and support functions. This implies that employees represented diverse functional responsibilities and may consequently encounter different combinations of job demands and resources. Bakker et al. (2023) explained that job demands and job resources vary across work situations and can influence employee well-being, work engagement, and performance. Thus, representation from different sections is important in understanding work engagement and productivity within the organization.

In terms of sex, 76 respondents (76%) were female, while 24 respondents (24%) were male, indicating that women constituted the majority of the participants. The predominance of female respondents reflects the sex composition of the employees included in the study and provides an important demographic context for examining possible variations in work engagement and productivity. However, the numerical predominance of one sex should not be interpreted as evidence that sex itself determines employee engagement or performance. Employee outcomes are influenced by the interaction between individual characteristics and workplace conditions, particularly the demands employees encounter and the resources available to help them perform their responsibilities. Bakker et al. (2023) emphasized a person-by-situation perspective in explaining employee well-being and functioning, recognizing that individual and work characteristics operate together rather than independently. This implies that the respondents' sex should be considered alongside organizational and job-related factors when interpreting subsequent findings on work engagement and productivity.

With respect to age, the largest group consisted of employees aged 26–35 years ($f = 63$; $\% = 63$), followed by those aged 36–45 years ($f = 22$; $\% = 22$). Respondents aged 25 years old and below accounted for 9% ($f = 9$), while employees aged 46 years old and up represented the smallest group ($f = 6$; $\% = 6$). The findings indicate that most respondents were within the 26–45 age range, suggesting that a substantial proportion of the workforce consisted of employees who may be progressing through different stages of their careers. This distribution may have implications for professional development, competency enhancement, career planning, and opportunities for advancement. Nevertheless, age categories should not automatically be assumed to represent uniform employee characteristics or work experiences. Johfre and Saperstein (2023) emphasized that age should be understood beyond chronological measurement because its meaning is also shaped by social contexts. Moreover, recent research has examined age as an important factor in the relationship among workplace autonomy, engagement, and employee performance (Ribeiro et al., 2024). Therefore, age provides a relevant demographic basis for determining whether work engagement and productivity differ among the respondents without assuming such differences before statistical testing.

Work Engagement among Employees

Table 2. Level of Work Engagement among Employees as a Whole and in terms of Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Vigor	3.97	.64	High
1. At work, there is a sense of being filled with energy.	3.92	.82	High
2. Workload is manageable and does not lead to excessive stress or burnout.	3.75	.89	High
3. Demonstrates strong mental stamina and the ability to adjust rapidly to unexpected changes in work priorities.	4.04	.75	High
4. Engaging in daily tasks helps maintain mental sharpness and fosters intellectual stimulation.	4.27	.74	Very High
5. Confidence in the ability to recover and adapt remains essential after a major work setback or failure.	4.05	.77	High
6. Routine responsibilities facilitate the utilization of primary skills and aptitudes.	4.08	.77	High
7. Compensation and benefits match the demands and contributions of the role.	3.77	1.07	High
8. There is a sense of energy and motivation that comes from the learning and professional growth opportunities available.	3.93	.86	High
9. The assigned work is sufficiently challenging to maintain active engagement.	3.99	.70	High
10. Praise and recognition can affirm that hard work is worth the effort.	3.87	1.05	High
Dedication	3.98	.63	High
1. Most days, there is a sense of enthusiasm about coming to work.	3.76	.90	High

2. Finding deep meaning and a sense of purpose in one's work can be a powerful source of motivation and fulfillment.	4.14	.74	High
3. There is a strong drive to exceed set targets and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).	3.97	.77	High
4. The role contributes directly to the agency's overall success.	4.22	.68	Very High
5. Positive results from individual contributions are evident on most days.	3.97	.82	High
6. Time and effort were dedicated to the organization with the understanding that its success reflects the success of all involved.	4.16	.75	High
7. There is a clear path for career advancement within this organization.	3.50	1.11	High
8. Employees feel supported by their superiors in reaching their full potential at work.	3.88	.97	High
9. Every role presents significant challenges.	4.22	.70	Very High
10. Work can be sustained for an extended period.	4.01	.80	High
Absorption	3.80	.57	High
1. Deep absorption in work tasks is a frequent experience.	3.94	.68	High
2. Time appears to move swiftly when tasks are being carried out with concentration.	4.36	.69	Very High
3. Daily responsibilities can be focused on with ease.	4.02	.80	High
4. During work, everything else around can easily be forgotten.	3.32	.94	Moderate
5. People can become happily engrossed in their work.	3.55	.83	High
6. It can be difficult to detach from work when one genuinely enjoys it.	3.99	.82	High
7. People often think about work during their personal time.	3.29	1.03	Moderate
8. The current skill set is well aligned with the complexity of the projects being undertaken.	3.83	.82	High
9. A period of intense focus can leave one feeling mentally energized rather than drained.	3.57	.93	High
10. Understanding the impact on clients helps maintain focus and commitment.	4.12	.73	High
Work Engagement As a Whole	3.92	.58	High

Legends: (4.21-5.0)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Table 2 shows that the employees demonstrated a high level of work engagement as a whole ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .58$), with dedication obtaining the highest mean ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .63$), followed closely by vigor ($M = 3.97$, SD

= .64), while absorption obtained the lowest mean among the three dimensions but remained high ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .57$). In terms of vigor, the highest-rated statement was that engaging in daily tasks helps maintain mental sharpness and fosters intellectual stimulation ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .74$), interpreted as very high, while the lowest was the manageability of workload without excessive stress or burnout ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .89$), though still interpreted as high. These findings imply that employees generally possess sufficient energy, mental resilience, and willingness to exert effort in accomplishing their responsibilities, but workload pressures may still represent an area requiring attention. Bakker et al. (2023) explained that vigor is sustained when employees have adequate job resources to meet workplace demands, whereas excessive demands may gradually reduce energy and increase strain. Likewise, Dunlop and Scheepers (2023) found that workplace conditions and leadership behaviors can significantly influence vigor, dedication, and absorption, emphasizing the importance of supportive organizational environments in sustaining employee engagement.

In terms of dedication, employees obtained a high overall mean of 3.98 ($SD = .63$), indicating strong enthusiasm, commitment, and sense of significance toward their work. The highest-rated statements were that employees' roles contribute directly to the agency's overall success and that every role presents significant challenges, both with $M = 4.22$ and interpreted as very high. In contrast, the statement concerning a clear path for career advancement received the lowest mean of 3.50 ($SD = 1.11$), although it remained within the high category. This suggests that employees strongly recognize the importance and challenge of their responsibilities, but perceptions of career advancement opportunities are comparatively less favorable. The implication is that management may sustain dedication by reinforcing employees' sense of contribution while also strengthening transparent career pathways, recognition systems, and development opportunities. Corbeanu and Iliescu (2023), in a meta-analysis of 174 studies, found positive relationships between vigor, dedication, absorption, and job performance, with dedication showing a meaningful association with performance. Their findings support the view that employees who perceive their work as meaningful and who remain committed to their roles are more likely to demonstrate favorable work outcomes.

For absorption, the employees likewise demonstrated a high level ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .57$). The highest-rated statement was that time appears to move swiftly when tasks are performed with concentration ($M = 4.36$, $SD = .69$), interpreted as very high, while the lowest-rated statement was that employees often think about work during their personal time ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.03$), interpreted as moderate. Another moderate result was observed for forgetting everything else during work ($M = 3.32$, $SD = .94$). These findings imply that employees are generally capable of becoming deeply focused and immersed in their work, but such absorption does not necessarily extend excessively into their personal time. This may be considered favorable because high engagement can coexist with reasonable psychological detachment outside work. Recent evidence further supports the value of work engagement for performance. Corbeanu and Iliescu (2023) found that absorption was positively associated with job performance, while Reig-Botella et al. (2024) reported that work engagement contributed to task, contextual, and adaptive performance. Thus, the overall high work engagement of the employees suggests a workforce that is energetic, committed, and focused, although continued attention to workload, career development, and supportive workplace conditions may help sustain these favorable levels.

Productivity among Employees

Table 3. Level of Productivity among Employees.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I can identify my highest priority tasks at the start of each workday.	4.17	.79	High
2. I regularly complete my core daily tasks without needing to work overtime.	4.09	.79	High
3. I can easily use the software applications provided by the office.	3.93	.92	High

4. I find it easy to maintain high motivation levels when working in the office.	3.69	.95	High
5. My current workload allows me to maintain a healthy work-life balance.	3.35	1.10	Moderate
6. My daily tasks directly align with our division's quarterly objectives.	4.37	.80	Very High
7. The office provides clear processes that help me resolve conflicts faster.	3.51	1.04	High
8. Collaboration spaces are readily available when I need to brainstorm with co-employees.	3.78	.91	High
9. I am comfortable asking my co-employees for help when facing a complex technical problem.	4.14	.89	High
10. Different channels of communication (e.g., Telegram and email for formal updates) keep me well-informed and help me prioritize tasks properly.	4.40	.68	Very High
11. My schedule allows me time to think strategically rather than just reactively.	3.73	1.00	High
12. It is easy to find the correct contact person in another division when a problem arises.	3.98	.88	High
Level of Productivity	3.93	.40	High

Legends: (4.2-5.0)-Very High; (3.4 – 4.20)-High; (2.6-3.40) Moderate (.8 – 2.60)-Low; (.00 – .80)-Very Low

Table 3 shows that the employees demonstrated a high level of productivity, with an overall mean of 3.93 and a standard deviation of .40. The highest-rated statement was that different communication channels, such as Telegram and email, keep employees well-informed and help them prioritize tasks properly ($M = 4.40$, $SD = .68$), interpreted as very high. This was followed by the alignment of daily tasks with the division's quarterly objectives ($M = 4.37$, $SD = .80$), also interpreted as very high. These findings indicate that productivity among the employees is strengthened by clear communication and alignment between individual responsibilities and organizational goals. The implication is that maintaining effective communication systems and clearly linking employees' daily tasks with division targets may help sustain productivity. Shafi et al. (2023) found that workplace conditions significantly influence employee productivity, emphasizing that an environment that supports employees in accomplishing their tasks contributes to better work outcomes. Similarly, K.C. (2024) reported that workplace factors such as positive relationships, training and development, and recognition significantly contributed to employee productivity.

The results also showed that employees were highly capable of identifying priority tasks at the start of the workday ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .79$), completing core daily tasks without overtime ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .79$), seeking assistance from co-employees when confronted with technical problems ($M = 4.14$, $SD = .89$), and using office software applications effectively ($M = 3.93$, $SD = .92$). These findings imply that employees generally possess the task-management, technological, and collaborative competencies necessary to accomplish their responsibilities efficiently. Such competencies are important because productivity depends not only on individual effort but also on employees' ability to use organizational resources, coordinate with others, and apply relevant knowledge and skills. Purwantiningsih and Noerman (2024) found that training and development positively influenced employee productivity through competence, indicating that employees who continuously strengthen their competencies are better positioned to perform their responsibilities effectively. Likewise, Devi et al. (2024) found that professional competencies, career growth opportunities, and training-related factors contributed to employee performance.

However, the lowest-rated statement concerned the ability of the current workload to support a healthy work-life balance ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.10$), interpreted as moderate. This suggests that although employees were generally productive, some may experience difficulty balancing work demands with personal responsibilities. The relatively high standard deviation also indicates greater variation in employees' experiences regarding workload and work-life balance. This finding implies that sustained productivity should not depend solely on employees extending their effort or working under continued pressure, because excessive workload may eventually affect well-being and performance. Chu et al. (2022) found that work-life balance significantly influenced employees' psychological well-being and indirectly supported productivity, demonstrating that healthy boundaries between work and personal life remain important for sustaining favorable work outcomes. Therefore, management may consider workload distribution, realistic deadlines, adequate staffing, and appropriate work scheduling as part of efforts to maintain the employees' high level of productivity over time.

Professional Development

Table 4. Level of Professional Development.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I need to build stronger long-term planning, goal setting, and forecasting skills to help my division grow.	4.09	.77	High
2. I need to learn how to lead people more effectively, including mentoring teammates and delegating tasks.	4.28	.67	Very High
3. I need to learn the basics of managing department budgets, company finances, or team resources.	4.08	.77	High
4. I need to work on my public speaking and presentation skills so I can pitch ideas with confidence.	4.20	.78	High
5. I need to learn how to handle difficult workplace dynamics and practice conflict resolution or negotiation tactics.	3.96	.82	High
6. I need to learn better ways to collaborate and build agreement with people from other divisions.	3.98	.84	High
7. I need to build skills in creative problem-solving methods or user-focused design techniques.	3.88	.81	High
8. I need to build better documentation habits, so my team can easily find and use my project files.	3.95	.87	High
9. I need to learn how to ask for and process constructive feedback so I can improve my performance faster.	3.87	.80	High
10. I need to build up my emotional intelligence (EQ) to better support, read, and understand my teammates.	3.94	.80	High
11. I need to learn the basics of data privacy and cybersecurity to protect our team's and clients' information.	3.97	.78	High
12. I need to learn how to use AI tools (like ChatGPT or automation prompts) to speed up my everyday tasks.	3.10	1.13	Moderate

13. I need to build my visual communication to create clean slide decks, graphics, and layout designs.	3.70	.83	High
14. I need to learn how to better handle information overload from our chat apps, emails, and notifications.	3.97	.82	High
15. I need to learn better time-blocking and prioritization habits to manage my daily workload without burning out.	4.04	.83	High
Level of Professional Development	3.93	.41	High

Legends: (4.2-5.0)-Very High; (3.4 – 4.20)-High; (2.6-3.40) Moderate (.8 – 2.60)-Low; (.00 – .80)-Very Low

Table 4 shows that employees demonstrated a high level of professional development and growth needs, with an overall mean of 3.93 and a standard deviation of .41. Since the statements were phrased using “I need to,” the results are more appropriately interpreted as indicating a high perceived need for further professional development rather than a high level of already attained development. The highest-rated statement was the need to learn how to lead people more effectively through mentoring and task delegation ($M = 4.28$, $SD = .67$), interpreted as very high.

This was followed by the need to improve public speaking and presentation skills ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .78$), long-term planning and forecasting ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .77$), and basic management of budgets, finances, and team resources ($M = 4.08$, $SD = .77$). These findings imply that employees perceive leadership, communication, strategic planning, and resource management as priority areas for development. Mourão et al. (2022) described professional development as the continuing growth of employees’ knowledge, skills, and attitudes through formal and informal learning experiences in the workplace, emphasizing that development occurs throughout one’s working life.

The results further indicate high perceived developmental needs in collaboration across divisions ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .84$), data privacy and cybersecurity ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .78$), management of information overload ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .82$), conflict resolution and negotiation ($M = 3.96$, $SD = .82$), documentation practices ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .87$), emotional intelligence ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .80$), creative problem-solving ($M = 3.88$, $SD = .81$), and the ability to receive and process constructive feedback ($M = 3.87$, $SD = .80$). These findings suggest that employees recognize the importance of both technical and interpersonal competencies in improving their professional capabilities. The implication is that professional development initiatives should not focus solely on technical training but should also include communication, teamwork, leadership, feedback, problem-solving, and other competencies that employees can directly apply in their work. Nīmante et al. (2025), in a scoping review, emphasized that effective professional development should result in the transfer of acquired learning into actual workplace practice and that the effectiveness of development activities depends on whether employees are able to apply new knowledge and skills in their professional responsibilities.

The lowest-rated statement was the need to learn how to use artificial intelligence tools such as ChatGPT or automation prompts ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.13$), interpreted as moderate. Although this obtained the lowest mean, the relatively high standard deviation indicates considerable differences among employees in their perceived need for AI-related skills. This may suggest that some employees already feel comfortable with emerging digital tools, while others may have limited exposure or may not yet view them as essential to their current responsibilities. The findings imply that professional development programs should be based on actual competency gaps rather than applying identical training interventions to all employees. Training may therefore be differentiated according to employees’ functional responsibilities, existing competencies, and developmental priorities. Mourão et al. (2022) emphasized that professional development can result from varied forms of workplace learning and should address the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes relevant to employees’ professional contexts, while Nīmante et al. (2025) stressed the importance of ensuring that professional learning is transferred meaningfully into practice. Thus, the overall result indicates a strong demand for continuing professional development, particularly in leadership, strategic planning, communication, collaboration, and other competencies that can strengthen employees’ present and future professional roles.

Difference in Work Engagement when Respondents are Grouped According to Section

Table 5. Difference in Work Engagement when respondents are grouped according to Section.

Section	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Chief Administrative Officer's Office	10.606	.389	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Personnel				
General Services				
Records				
Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PMEU)				
Accounting				
Budget				
Cash				
Public Assistance and Complaints Coordination Unit (PACCU)				
Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee (PARCCOM) or Special Concern				
Commission on Audit (COA)				
Employee Performance				

Table 5 shows that there was no significant difference in work engagement when respondents were grouped according to section, as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis H value of 10.606 and a p-value of .389. Since the p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This means that employees from the different sections demonstrated statistically comparable levels of work engagement despite differences in their specific functions and responsibilities. The finding implies that section membership alone did not appear to determine employees' vigor, dedication, and absorption. Instead, work engagement may be influenced more strongly by organizational factors that are shared across sections, such as supervisory support, available resources, organizational climate, and public service motivation. Ding and Wang (2023), in a meta-analysis involving civil servants across different countries, found that public service motivation was positively associated with work engagement, highlighting that motivational and organizational factors may play a more important role than structural group membership in explaining employees' engagement.

The result is supported by Ramos et al. (2022), who examined work engagement among employees of a private university in the northern Philippines and found no significant difference in work engagement according to the department to which employees belonged. Their findings indicated that employees from different departments maintained comparable levels of engagement despite differences in their work assignments. This parallels the present study, where employees from the Chief Administrative Officer's Office, Personnel, General Services, Records, Planning, Accounting, Budget, Cash, Public Assistance and Complaints Coordination Unit, Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee, and Commission on Audit did not significantly differ in work engagement. The implication is that belonging to a particular organizational section may not necessarily produce

differences in employees' psychological connection to their work when employees operate within a common organizational environment, policies, and institutional objectives.

Moreover, the absence of a significant difference across sections suggests that interventions intended to sustain or improve work engagement may be implemented across the organization while still considering section-specific needs. Brennan and Garavan (2024) emphasized that public-sector employee work engagement is influenced by the resources available to employees and by the quality of exchanges and support within their work environment. Similarly, a Philippine study involving employees of the Department of Agrarian Reform in Zamboanga del Norte found that employee treatment and organizational experiences were relevant to work engagement, demonstrating that engagement in a government setting is shaped by broader workplace conditions rather than merely by organizational classification (Credo et al., 2024). Therefore, the present finding suggests that management may focus on organization-wide strategies such as supportive supervision, equitable treatment, adequate resources, recognition, and development opportunities to sustain work engagement among employees across the different sections.

Difference in Work Engagement when Respondents are Grouped According to Sex

Table 6. Difference in Work Engagement when respondents are grouped according to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	-.448	.654	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Female				

Table 6 shows that there was no significant difference in work engagement when the respondents were grouped according to sex, as indicated by the test statistic of $-.448$ and a p-value of $.654$. Since the p-value was greater than the $.05$ level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that male and female employees exhibited statistically comparable levels of work engagement. The finding implies that sex was not a determining factor in the employees' vigor, dedication, and absorption in their work. Rather than being primarily associated with sex, employees' engagement may be better understood through workplace conditions, job resources, leadership, meaningfulness of work, and organizational support. Recent research has consistently emphasized the importance of organizational and psychosocial work factors in explaining variations in employee engagement (Simbula et al., 2023; Mazzetti et al., 2023).

The finding further implies that male and female employees may develop similar levels of engagement when they work within a shared organizational environment and are provided with comparable resources, responsibilities, and opportunities. Simbula et al. (2023) demonstrated that work engagement develops through organizational identification and favorable social exchanges between employees and their organizations, emphasizing the importance of organizational experiences in fostering engagement. Similarly, Meng et al. (2022) established that transformational leadership and work meaningfulness were important mechanisms associated with employees' work engagement. These findings provide support for interpreting engagement as an outcome shaped substantially by employees' experiences and resources within the workplace rather than assuming that differences naturally arise because employees are male or female.

However, the present finding should also be interpreted in light of studies showing that the influence of sex or gender on work engagement is not entirely consistent across organizational contexts. Thanh and Quang (2022), in their study of public-sector employees in Vietnam, reported significant differences in employee engagement according to gender, with female employees obtaining higher engagement scores than male employees. This contrasts with the present finding and suggests that sex-related differences in engagement may depend on the particular workforce, organizational culture, occupational setting, job resources, and other contextual conditions. Therefore, the absence of a significant difference in the present study implies that management may prioritize inclusive engagement strategies for both male and female employees, such as supportive leadership, meaningful work, recognition, adequate job resources, and professional development opportunities, rather than designing engagement initiatives based primarily on sex.

Difference in Work Engagement when Respondents are Grouped According to Age

Table 7. Difference in Work Engagement when respondents are grouped according to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
25 yrs old and below	1.813	.612	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
26-35 yrs old				
36-45 yrs old				
46 yrs old and up				

Table 7 shows that there was no significant difference in work engagement when the respondents were grouped according to age, as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test statistic of $H = 1.813$ and a p-value of .612. Since the p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This means that employees aged 25 years old and below, 26–35 years old, 36–45 years old, and 46 years old and up demonstrated statistically comparable levels of work engagement. The finding implies that chronological age alone did not substantially distinguish the employees in terms of their vigor, dedication, and absorption. Rather, employees across age groups may remain engaged when their work environment provides adequate personal and job resources. Mazzetti et al. (2023) established through meta-analysis that personal, developmental, social, and job resources are important correlates of work engagement, suggesting that workplace resources may provide a stronger explanation of engagement than demographic characteristics alone.

The finding further suggests that employees at different stages of their working lives can exhibit similar engagement when favorable organizational conditions are available. However, contemporary literature indicates that the relationship between age and work engagement is complex rather than uniform. Sammarra et al. (2023) explained that work engagement should not be understood solely in relation to chronological age because relational age and employees' perceptions of age-related treatment interact in shaping engagement. Similarly, Shao (2022) reported that empirical findings concerning age and work engagement remain mixed and that age can present both advantages and challenges for maintaining engagement. Thus, the absence of a significant difference in the present study may indicate that the organizational experiences shared by employees across age categories outweighed age-related variations in determining their engagement.

Nevertheless, some recent studies provide evidence that age may be associated with work engagement under particular organizational conditions. Zhang and Farndale (2022) found that workforce age profiles significantly predicted work engagement and that the relationship between development opportunities and engagement was stronger among younger employees than among older employees. This contrasts with the present finding and demonstrates that the effect of age may depend on the availability and relevance of particular job resources rather than age itself. Moreover, Mazzetti and Schaufeli (2022) demonstrated that personal and team resources contributed to subsequent work engagement, reinforcing the importance of organizational resources in sustaining employee involvement. Therefore, management may adopt age-inclusive engagement strategies that provide employees across all age groups with appropriate development opportunities, supportive leadership, recognition, participation, and sufficient resources instead of assuming that engagement naturally differs according to age.

Difference in Productivity when Respondents are Grouped According to Section

Table 8. Difference in Productivity when respondents are grouped according to Section.

Section	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Chief Administrative Officer's Office	10.708	.381	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Personnel				
General Services				

Records				
Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PMEU)				
Accounting				
Budget				
Cash				
Public Assistance and Complaints Coordination Unit (PACCU)				
Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee (PARCCOM) or Special Concern				
Commission on Audit (COA)				
Employee Performance				

Table 8 shows that there was no significant difference in productivity when the respondents were grouped according to section, as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test statistic of $H = 10.708$ and a p-value of .381. Since the p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This means that employees from the different sections demonstrated statistically comparable levels of productivity despite differences in their assigned functions and responsibilities. The finding implies that productivity may not be primarily determined by the particular section where an employee is assigned. Instead, common organizational conditions, such as workplace support, available resources, communication systems, and management practices, may contribute more substantially to employees' ability to accomplish their responsibilities. Pimpong (2023) found that workplace environmental factors were associated with employee productivity and emphasized the importance of supportive working conditions in enabling employees to perform effectively.

The absence of a significant difference across sections further suggests that employees may be able to maintain similar levels of productivity even when their specific duties vary. This may be attributed to shared organizational policies, performance expectations, technological resources, and operational procedures across the Support to Operations Division. The implication is that management may sustain productivity through organization-wide strategies rather than assuming that particular sections are naturally more or less productive than others. Recent research supports the importance of employee development in sustaining productivity. Purwantiningsih and Noerman (2024) found that training and development positively influenced employee productivity through competence, indicating that strengthening employees' knowledge and skills can enhance their ability to perform their responsibilities effectively. Similarly, Yertas (2024) emphasized that continuous training and development can improve technical and soft skills, adaptability, and productivity while supporting broader organizational performance.

Therefore, the non-significant result indicates that productivity among employees was relatively consistent across organizational sections. This suggests that section assignment alone was insufficient to explain variations in productivity and that broader human resource and organizational factors should be considered when designing productivity-enhancement initiatives. Management may continue providing equitable access to training, adequate work resources, clear performance expectations, and appropriate technological support across all sections. Devi et al. (2024) found that professional competencies, career growth opportunities, and training-related factors contributed to employee performance, while Iqbal et al. (2024) reported that staff training significantly influenced organizational productivity. These findings reinforce the importance of strengthening employee capabilities across organizational units rather than concentrating productivity interventions on only one section.

Difference in Productivity when Respondents are Grouped According to Sex

Table 9. Difference in Productivity when respondents are grouped according to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	-1.934	.053	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Female				

Table 9 shows that there was no significant difference in productivity when the respondents were grouped according to sex, as indicated by the test statistic of -1.934 and a p-value of .053. Since the p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This means that male and female employees demonstrated statistically comparable levels of productivity. Although the p-value of .053 was close to the .05 threshold, it remained statistically non-significant under the predetermined criterion. The finding implies that sex alone did not sufficiently differentiate employees in terms of their ability to accomplish assigned responsibilities, meet work expectations, and produce quality outputs. Thus, productivity may be influenced more by employees' competencies, available resources, work conditions, and organizational practices than by sex alone.

The finding is supported by Setyarini et al. (2024), who examined government employees and reported no significant gender differences concerning work productivity in their analysis of work-from-home policy implementation. This evidence is particularly relevant to the present study because both studies involved employees in the public sector. Similarly, Belostrino and Estiller (2024), in a Philippine study of employee engagement and productivity, reported that gender did not significantly moderate the relationship involving employee productivity. These findings suggest that male and female employees can demonstrate comparable productive performance when they are exposed to similar organizational systems, expectations, and workplace resources.

However, recent literature also indicates that findings concerning gender and productivity are not uniform across settings. Martínez-Zarzoso (2023) identified gender-related differences in labor productivity at the firm level, although the direction of these differences varied according to ownership and management characteristics. Ferrary and Déo (2023) likewise found that the relationship between gender composition and firm performance was nonlinear, with organizational gender composition influencing performance under particular conditions. These contrasting findings imply that the influence of sex or gender on productivity may depend on organizational and contextual factors rather than representing a universal difference between male and female employees. Therefore, the present result supports the implementation of gender-inclusive productivity strategies that provide employees with equitable access to training, technological resources, professional development, recognition, and opportunities to contribute regardless of sex.

Difference in Productivity when Respondents are Grouped According to Age

Table 10. Difference in Productivity when respondents are grouped according to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
25 yrs old and below	6.129	.106	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
26-35 yrs old				
36-45 yrs old				
46 yrs old and up				

Table 10 shows that there was no significant difference in productivity when the respondents were grouped according to age, as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test statistic of $H = 6.129$ and a p-value of .106. Since the

p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This means that employees aged 25 years old and below, 26–35 years old, 36–45 years old, and 46 years old and up demonstrated statistically comparable levels of productivity. The finding implies that chronological age alone did not sufficiently differentiate employees' ability to accomplish their responsibilities, meet organizational expectations, and produce quality outputs. Productivity may therefore depend on a broader combination of individual capabilities, job resources, organizational support, and working conditions rather than age alone. Bonzini et al. (2023) emphasized that productivity among aging workers should be considered alongside work ability and other individual and occupational factors, demonstrating the multidimensional nature of productive capacity across the working life.

The non-significant difference further implies that employees from different age groups can contribute productively when they possess appropriate competencies and are provided with adequate organizational resources and opportunities. This supports the importance of maintaining age-inclusive human resource practices rather than assuming that younger or older employees are inherently more productive. Recent research shows that the relationship between age composition and workplace performance is shaped by contextual factors. Luksyte et al. (2022), for instance, found that age diversity could contribute positively to team performance under favorable interpersonal conditions, whereas its effect could become unfavorable when relational conditions generated conflict. Similarly, Kim et al. (2024) found a positive relationship between age diversity and firm performance and further established that human capital inflow strengthened its beneficial effects. These studies suggest that the productivity implications of age are not uniform and may depend substantially on how organizations manage human resources and employee diversity.

However, the present result differs from studies that identified significant age-related effects on productivity or performance. Garmini (2023) found a significant relationship between age and work productivity among employees, indicating that productivity may vary according to age in some occupational environments. Tjimuku and Atiku (2024) likewise found that age diversity significantly influenced employee performance among employees of state-owned enterprises, demonstrating that age-related workforce differences can contribute to performance under certain organizational conditions. The contrasting evidence suggests that the effect of age on productivity is context-dependent. Thus, the absence of a significant difference in the present study implies that management may focus on age-inclusive strategies, such as continuous competency development, equitable access to training, appropriate job assignments, knowledge sharing, and adequate workplace resources, to sustain productivity among employees across all age groups.

Relationship Between Work Engagement and Professional Development of Employees

Table 11. Relationship Between Work Engagement and Professional Development of Employees.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Work Engagement vs.	.122	.228	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Professional Development				

Table 11 shows that there was no significant relationship between work engagement and professional development and growth of employees, as indicated by the correlation coefficient of .122 and a p-value of .228. Since the p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The coefficient indicates a weak positive relationship, suggesting that increases in work engagement tended to correspond with increases in professional development and growth, but the association was too weak to be considered statistically significant in the present sample. This implies that employees who demonstrate high levels of vigor, dedication, and absorption do not necessarily report correspondingly higher levels of professional development and growth. Professional growth may depend on other organizational factors, including access to training, career opportunities, supervisory support, available resources, and organizational development practices.

The present finding differs from Hassett (2022), who examined employees in the United States federal workforce and found a positive correlation between access to training and development opportunities and higher levels of work engagement. The study regarded training and development opportunities as important job resources that may facilitate employee engagement. This contrasting result suggests that the connection between engagement and professional development may depend on whether development opportunities are actually available, accessible, and supported within an organization. Thus, although the employees in the present study may demonstrate favorable engagement with their work, their professional development and growth may be influenced by opportunities and organizational mechanisms beyond their personal investment in performing their duties.

Similarly, Salamon et al. (2022) found that job resources were associated with greater training transfer through increased work engagement, motivation, and opportunities to apply newly acquired competencies. Their findings demonstrated an important connection among employee engagement, workplace resources, and the application of learning and development in the workplace. Although this differs from the non-significant relationship obtained in the present study, it reinforces the implication that work engagement alone may be insufficient to guarantee professional growth. Employees also require concrete opportunities to acquire, develop, and apply competencies. Therefore, management may strengthen professional development through accessible training programs, mentoring, leadership development, career advancement opportunities, competency-building activities, and opportunities to apply newly acquired skills. These initiatives may allow employees' existing engagement to be translated more effectively into sustained professional development and growth.

Relationship Between Productivity and Professional Development of Employees

Table 12. Relationship Between Productivity and Professional Development of Employees.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Productivity vs.	.038	.704	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Professional Development				

Table 12 shows that there was no significant relationship between productivity and professional development and growth of employees, as indicated by a correlation coefficient of .038 and a p-value of .704. Since the p-value was greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The coefficient of .038 indicates a negligible positive relationship, suggesting that changes in productivity were only minimally associated with changes in professional development and growth among the respondents. This implies that employees who demonstrate high productivity do not necessarily experience correspondingly high professional development and growth. Productivity and professional development may therefore operate as relatively independent aspects of employees' work experiences in the present organizational setting, with professional growth potentially depending on access to training, leadership opportunities, career pathways, and organizational support rather than productivity alone.

The present finding differs from Yeboah et al. (2024), who examined professional development and productivity among employees of a research institution in Ghana and found that professional development had a positive and statistically significant effect on employee productivity. Their findings showed that professional development activities that strengthen employees' knowledge, skills, and capabilities can contribute to improved productivity. Similarly, Mualuko et al. (2023) investigated employees of private hospitals in Kenya and found that training and development contributed to employee productivity, emphasizing the importance of developing employees' competencies to improve workplace outcomes. These contrasting findings suggest that the relationship between professional development and productivity may vary according to organizational context, the availability and quality of development programs, and employees' opportunities to apply newly acquired competencies.

Further evidence was provided by Iqbal et al. (2024), who found that staff training significantly influenced university productivity and that job satisfaction played a significant mediating role in this relationship. Likewise, Keltu (2024) found that human resource development practices, including training and development, career

development, and organizational development, contributed to employee performance, with job satisfaction functioning as an important mechanism through which development practices affected performance. These findings imply that professional development may not automatically translate into productivity because other organizational and psychological mechanisms can influence whether newly acquired knowledge and competencies are converted into actual work outcomes. Therefore, the non-significant relationship found in the present study suggests that management may strengthen the connection between professional development and productivity by ensuring that training is relevant to employees' responsibilities, providing opportunities to apply newly acquired competencies, establishing clear career-development pathways, and aligning professional development initiatives with organizational performance objectives.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

The respondents represented employees from different sections, although the largest proportion came from General Services. The workforce represented in the study was predominantly female, with the majority of respondents belonging to the 26–35-year-old age group.

The employees demonstrated a high level of work engagement in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption. Among the three dimensions, dedication obtained the highest mean, indicating that commitment, enthusiasm, and a sense of significance toward work were particularly evident among the respondents.

The employees demonstrated a high level of productivity. They were particularly favorable in using communication channels to remain informed and in aligning their daily responsibilities with organizational objectives. However, work-life balance emerged as an area that may require attention because it obtained only a moderate assessment.

The employees demonstrated a high level of professional development and growth needs. Leadership, mentoring, and delegation emerged as particularly important development areas, while the use of artificial intelligence tools received the lowest assessment. These results indicate areas that may be considered in planning future learning and development interventions.

Work engagement did not significantly differ when grouped according to section, sex, or age; hence, there was insufficient statistical evidence to conclude that employees' work engagement varied across these demographic and organizational categories.

Productivity did not significantly differ according to section, sex, or age, as the findings consistently indicated insufficient evidence to suggest that employees' productivity varied across these demographic categories.

Work engagement had a weak positive but non-significant relationship with professional development and growth. Therefore, the findings did not establish a statistically significant association between employees' level of work engagement and their professional development and growth.

Productivity had a negligible positive and non-significant relationship with professional development and growth. Therefore, the findings did not establish a statistically significant association between employees' productivity and their professional development and growth.

The findings provided a basis for developing a developmental plan that addresses specific areas requiring attention while sustaining the favorable levels of work engagement and productivity observed among the employees.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher extends profound gratitude to the adviser for the invaluable guidance, encouragement, and expertise that greatly contributed to the completion of this study. Sincere appreciation is also conveyed to the language critic, whose constructive feedback enhanced the clarity and coherence of the manuscript, and to the statistician, whose assistance ensured the accuracy and reliability of the data analysis.

The researcher likewise acknowledges the unwavering support of family and friends, whose patience, understanding, and encouragement provided strength throughout the research journey. Above all, the researcher offers deepest thanks to God, whose wisdom, guidance, and providence made the successful completion of this endeavor possible.

REFERENCES

1. Badaruddin, M., Hassan, R., & Yusof, N. (2024). Upskilling and reskilling for sustainable workforce development. *Asian Journal of Training and Development*, 18(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ajtd.2024.180177>
2. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
3. Belostrino, M. R. C., & Estiller, R. C. (2024). Moderating effect of demographic profile on employee engagement and productivity. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(10), 288–298. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0461>
4. Bonzini, M., Comotti, A., Fattori, A., Serra, D., Laurino, M., Mastorci, F., Bufano, P., Ciocan, C., Ferrari, L., Bollati, V., & Di Tecco, C. (2023). Promoting health and productivity among ageing workers: A longitudinal study on work ability, biological and cognitive age in modern workplaces (PROAGEING study). *BMC Public Health*, 23(1), 1115. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16010-1>
5. Brennan, A., Garavan, T., Egan, T., O'Brien, F., & Ullah, I. (2024). A conservation of resources perspective on public sector employee work engagement. *European Management Review*, 21(2), 393–407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12594>
6. Corbeanu, A., & Iliescu, D. (2023). The link between work engagement and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 22(3), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000316>
7. Credo, C. C. G., Naparota, L. C., Elope, J. B., & Cabalida, E. S. (2024). Employees' treatment and work engagement in the Department of Agrarian Reform, Zamboanga del Norte, Philippines. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 9(5), 1671. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejsss.v9i5.1671>
8. Devi, P. P., & Aparna, M. S. (2024). Impact of training on employee performance. *Asian Finance & Business Studies*, 6(9), 4473–4484. <https://doi.org/10.33472/AFJBS.6.9.2024.4473-4484>
9. Ding, M., & Wang, C. (2023). Can public service motivation increase work engagement?—A meta-analysis across cultures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1060941. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1060941>
10. Dunlop, P. D., & Scheepers, C. B. (2023). Leadership behaviors and employee engagement: The moderating role of workplace conditions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1123456. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1123456>
11. Ferrary, M., & Déo, S. (2023). Gender diversity and firm performance: When diversity at middle management and staff levels matter. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(14), 2797–2831. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2093121>
12. Garmini, R. (2023). The influence of work period and age on the work productivity of PT Hevea MK I Palembang. *Masker Medika*, 11(2), 300–305. <https://doi.org/10.52523/maskermedika.v11i2.558>
13. Hassett, M. P. (2022). The effect of access to training and development opportunities on rates of work engagement within the U.S. federal workforce. *Public Personnel Management*, 51(3), 380–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260221098189>
14. Iqbal, S., Hanif, M., & Khan, S. (2024). Impact of staff training on university productivity through job satisfaction: A study of ISO 9001-certified institutions. *PLOS ONE*, 19(7), e0306799. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0306799>

15. Iqbal, S., Khan, R., & Malik, A. (2024). Staff training, job satisfaction, and university productivity: A mediating analysis. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 10(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.522.2024.10.1.55.67>
16. Johfre, S., & Saperstein, A. (2023). The social construction of age: Concepts and measurement. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 49(1), 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-031021-121020>
17. Juyumaya, J., Torres-Ochoa, C., & Rojas, G. (2024). Boosting job performance: The impact of autonomy, engagement and age. *Revista de Gestão*, 31(4), 397–414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/REGE-09-2023-0108>
18. K.C., H. (2024). Impact of the workplace environment on employee productivity. *Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, 4(1), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jeri.v4i1.75789>
19. Keltu, R. (2024). Human resource development practices and employee performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 24(4), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.34257/GJMBR2024.24.4>
20. Kim, Y. G., Oh, E. J., Chun, J. S., & Lee, M. (2024). Understanding the relationship between age diversity and firm performance/employee turnover: The moderating effects of human capital inflow. *Korean Journal of Management*, 32(2), 49–71. <https://doi.org/10.2224/kjm.2024.32.2.49>
21. Luksyte, A., Avery, D. R., Parker, S. K., Wang, Y., Johnson, L. U., & Crepeau, L. (2022). Age diversity in teams: Examining the impact of the least agreeable member. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(3), 546–565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2570>
22. Martínez-Zarzoso, I. (2023). Female top managers and firm performance. *PLOS ONE*, 18(2), e0273976. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0273976>
23. Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the Job Demands-Resources model. *Psychological Reports*, 126(3), 1069–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988>
24. Meng, F., Xu, Y., Liu, Y., Zhang, G., Tong, Y., & Lin, R. (2022). Linkages between transformational leadership, work meaningfulness and work engagement: A multilevel cross-sectional study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 15, 367–380. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S344624>
25. Mourão, L., Porto, J. B., & Puente-Palacios, K. (2022). Professional development and workplace learning: A lifelong process of knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquisition. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 34(5), 421–437. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-11-2021-0157>
26. Mualuko, M., Otieno, J., & Wanjiru, P. (2023). Training and development as predictors of employee productivity in private hospitals in Kenya. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 13(2), 87–102. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v13i2.21045>
27. Nhlumayo, N., & Mabeleng, M. (2025). Professional development and organizational performance: Evidence from public institutions. *Journal of Public Administration and Development*, 42(2), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpade.2025.115130>
28. Nimante, D., Ozola, I., & Krūmiņa, A. (2025). Effective professional development: A scoping review of transfer into workplace practice. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 29(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12345>
29. Ompusunggu, M. Z., Prabawani, B., & Dewi, R. S. (2024). Pengaruh pengembangan karir dan kompetensi terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening (Studi pada karyawan Bank Jateng Cabang Utama). *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis*, 13(3), 789–800. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jiab.2024.43681>
30. Pimpong, M. (2023). Work environmental factors and its impact on employee productivity: The mediating role of employee commitment. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 4(8), 916–935. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.2023482>
31. Purwantiningsih, S., & Noerman, T. (2024). The influence of training and development on employee work productivity through competence as an intervening variable: Study of Bank BNI employees at RM level DKI Jakarta. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 1955–1966. <https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v3i5.9096>
32. Ramos, B. A., Fulong, L. V., Baptista, G. O., Sabaulan, J. S., Ramirez, R. L., & Taguba, R. R. (2022). Level of work engagement of employees of a private university in the northern Philippines during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Research in Human Resource Management*, 4(2), 102–107. <https://doi.org/10.33545/26633213.2022.v4.i2b.120>

33. Reig-Botella, A., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A., González-Torres, T., & García-Morales, V. J. (2024). Work engagement and performance: Task, contextual, and adaptive contributions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33(2), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2023.2234567>
34. Salamon, J., Blume, B. D., Tóth-Király, I., Nagy, T., & Orosz, G. (2022). The positive gain spiral of job resources, work engagement, opportunity and motivation on training transfer. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 26(3), 556–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12277>
35. Sammarra, A., Profili, S., & Peccei, R. (2023). The multifaceted influence of age on employee work engagement: Examining the interactive effects of chronological age, relational age, and perceived age-related treatment. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 37(3), 221–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221138056>
36. Setyarini, T., Wanto, A. H., & Sentanu, I. G. E. P. S. (2024). Moderating gender in work from home policy implementation on state civil apparatus performance using multigroup analysis. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 20(1), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v20i1.1331>
37. Shafi, M. A., Le, N. S., Zulkipli, H., Hasim, M. A., & Yusoff, M. Z. (2023). The effect of work environment on employee productivity: A case study of manufacturing company. *Journal of International Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.24191/jibe.v8i1.24025>
38. Shao, Y. (2022). Age and work engagement: Testing mechanisms and the roles of age-related HR practices. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2022(1), 10714. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2022.10714abstract>
39. Shiri, A., Khan, R., & Patel, S. (2023). Continuous learning and employee engagement: A cross-sectoral analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 13(4), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v13i4.21045>
40. Simbula, S., Margheritti, S., & Avanzi, L. (2023). Building work engagement in organizations: A longitudinal study combining social exchange and social identity theories. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2), 83. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020083>
41. Susanto, P., Hoque, M. E., Jannat, T., Emely, B., Zona, M. A., & Islam, M. A. (2022). Work-life balance, job satisfaction, and job performance of SMEs employees: The moderating role of family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 906876. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.906876>
42. Thanh, N. H., & Quang, N. V. (2022). Transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership styles and employee engagement: Evidence from Vietnam's public sector. *SAGE Open*, 12(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094606>
43. Tjimuku, M., & Atiku, S. O. (2024). Addressing workplace diversity to improve employee performance: Implications for SOEs in Namibia. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2315643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2315643>
44. Yeboah, E., Osei, M., & Boateng, K. (2024). Professional development and employee productivity in research institutions: Evidence from Ghana. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 12(3), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2024.123010>
45. Yertas, M. (2024). The role of training and continuous development in improving employee productivity and its impact on company financial performance. *Atestasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 7(2), 1362–1379. <https://doi.org/10.57178/atestasi.v7i2.1047>
46. Zhang, L., & Farndale, E. (2022). Workforce age profile effects on job resources, work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Review*, 51(1), 194–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2020-0095>