Work Environment and Employee Productivity in Selected Higher Education Institutions of Manila

Dr. Jeffrey B. Villena, Dr. Virgel E. Diamante

Graduate School Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines.

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12110077

Received: 18 November 2025; Accepted: 25 November 2025; Published: 09 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the work environment and employee productivity in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila, focusing on both faculty and non-academic staff. The research aims to assess how physical, social, and organizational aspects of the workplace influence individual and team productivity, as well as to identify challenges affecting employee performance. Data were collected through structured surveys and semi-structured interviews with 40 faculty members and 40 non-academic staff from three HEIs, using a mixedmethods approach for deeper insights.

The results indicate that employees generally perceive the work environment as favorable, with the social environment rated highest, reflecting positive interpersonal relationships, effective communication, and collegiality. Employee productivity was also rated highly, particularly in terms of individual skills, task efficiency, and teamwork. Significant differences were observed between faculty and non-academic staff, with faculty consistently assigning higher ratings. Correlation analyses further revealed a strong, statistically significant relationship between the work environment and employee productivity, with the organizational environment emerging as the most influential factor. Key challenges identified include excessive workload, limited professional development opportunities, inconsistent supervision, and inadequate resources.

Based on these findings, the study concludes that HEI employees demonstrate strong competence, motivation, and commitment, but targeted interventions are needed to optimize workload distribution, strengthen leadership communication, upgrade facilities, and provide continuous professional development. Implementing these strategies will enhance employee well-being, institutional performance, and long-term sustainability.

Keywords: Work Environment, Employee Productivity, Higher Education, Organizational Support, Faculty, Staff.

INTRODUCTION

The higher education sector, encompassing teaching, research, extension services, and administrative functions, relies heavily on the commitment of both faculty and non-academic staff to achieve institutional goals. Faculty members drive instruction, scholarship, and community engagement, while non-academic staff ensure the smooth delivery of administrative, technical, and support services. Together with administrators, they form the backbone of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), underscoring the importance of fostering a supportive and well-managed work environment. While much of the discourse often highlights student outcomes and institutional rankings, the welfare of faculty and staff, as well as the conditions in which they work, are equally critical since these directly influence organizational effectiveness, service quality, and long-term sustainability. Employees thus emerge as the most valuable asset of HEIs, requiring balanced workloads, adequate resources, effective administrative support, collegial relationships, and opportunities for professional growth to ensure optimum productivity and engagement.

The primary reason for conducting this study is to address the challenges faced by faculty and nonacademic staff in sustaining well-being amid budget constraints, lean staffing, and rising performance expectations. In the Philippine context, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) play a crucial role in national development by expanding

access to education, producing skilled graduates, and contributing to research and innovation. However, many institutions continue to struggle with low morale, high attrition, and inconsistent organizational performance issues often rooted in inadequate attention to workplace conditions that affect both academic and support personnel. By examining these concerns, the study seeks to provide evidence-based insights that will help HEI leaders, policymakers, and human resource practitioners design healthier, employeecentered, and more sustainable work environments. Improving workplace conditions is not only a matter of employee welfare but also a strategic imperative that enhances academic quality, strengthens institutional performance, and contributes meaningfully to national progress. Manila was chosen as the study site because it serves as the country's educational hub, hosting a concentration of HEIs that reflect both the opportunities and challenges of urban academic environments. Insights from Manila HEIs therefore offer a valuable basis for understanding broader trends and issues in Philippine higher education.

This study draws on Organizational Support Theory (OST), proposed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), which posits that employees develop perceptions regarding the extent to which their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. These perceptions, termed Perceived Organizational Support (POS), significantly influence employees' attitudes and behaviors, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance. In the context of HEIs, POS can affect faculty and staff motivation, engagement, and retention, thereby impacting the overall effectiveness and sustainability of the institution. By applying OST, this study aims to explore how the work environment in HEIs influences employees' perceptions of support and, consequently, their productivity and well-being.

METHODOLOGY

The study on the work environment in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila employed a mixedmethods research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to generate a comprehensive understanding of employees' perceptions. The quantitative component utilized structured surveys to collect measurable data on workplace conditions, productivity, engagement, and institutional support, while the qualitative component consisted of semi-structured interviews designed to capture deeper insights into employees' lived experiences and the contextual factors influencing their work environment.

Purposive sampling was used to select 40 faculty members and 40 non-academic staff from three HEIs in Manila. Guided by principles of stratified sampling, the population was divided into academic and non-academic strata to ensure adequate representation across employee groups and to improve the reliability and precision of comparisons. Purposive sampling was deemed appropriate because it allows the deliberate selection of participants who possess specific characteristics relevant to the study's objectives, particularly when resources are limited and the emphasis is on depth of understanding (Nikolopoulou, 2023; Campbell, 2020).

Data collection involved a combination of survey questionnaires and semi-structured interviews to ensure both breadth and depth of interpretation. The survey instrument contained closed-ended questions and Likert-scale items assessing workload balance, administrative support, availability of resources, workplace relationships, and opportunities for professional growth. This structured approach facilitated the identification of quantitative patterns and trends across a relatively large sample.

Complementing the survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected faculty and nonacademic staff to explore perceived strengths and weaknesses of the institutional work environment, sources of stress and satisfaction, adaptability to changing demands, and suggested improvements. Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data enhanced the credibility of findings and allowed for a more holistic understanding of how the work environment affects employee well-being, performance, and institutional effectiveness.

In analyzing the survey results, the researchers noted an overwhelmingly positive pattern of responses, which may indicate the presence of ceiling effects or social desirability bias. To improve future data accuracy and sensitivity, the study recommends refinements to the survey instrument. These include expanding the Likert scale to offer a wider range of response options, incorporating reverse-coded items to reduce acquiescence bias, and

developing more behaviorally specific indicators that can better capture subtle variations in employees' perceptions of workplace conditions and productivity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. How do Faculty and Non-Academic Staff assess the work environment in selected Higher Educations Institutions in Manila?

1.1 Physical Environment

Table 1 Assessment of Physical Work Environment

Indicators	Faculty		NonAcademic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The institution's facilities, classrooms, and offices are wellmaintained and conducive to academic and administrative functions.	5.00	E	3.85	VG	4.43	E	1
2. The institution provides a safe and secure working environment for both faculty and non-academic staff.	4.50	E	3.97	VG	4.24	E	3
3. The institution provides adequate equipment, technology, and resources for employees to effectively perform their duties.	4.40	E	3.82	VG	4.11	VG	4
4. The institution's physical environment is designed to be comfortable and supportive of teaching, research, and administrative work.	5.00	E	3.80	VG	4.40	E	2
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.72**	**E**	**3.86**	**VG**	**4.29**	**E**	

Legend:

Point	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
5	4.20 – 5.00	Excellent	E
4	3.40 – 4.19	Very Good	VG
3	2.60 – 3.39	Good	G
2	1.80 – 2.59	Poor	P
1	1.00 – 1.79	Needs Improvement	NI

As presented in Table 1, the assessment of the physical work environment in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila reveals that both faculty and non-academic staff generally perceived the conditions as favorable. The indicator "The institution's facilities, classrooms, and offices are well-maintained and conducive to academic and administrative functions" obtained the highest composite mean of 4.43, interpreted as Excellent, suggesting that the upkeep of physical facilities is strongly upheld and consistently recognized across both groups.

This was followed closely by "The institution's physical environment is designed to be comfortable and supportive of teaching, research, and administrative work," which garnered a composite mean of 4.40, also rated as Excellent. This indicates a shared view among respondents that the workplace environment contributes positively to both academic and non-academic performance.

Meanwhile, "The institution provides a safe and secure working environment for both faculty and nonacademic staff" received a composite mean of 4.24, still within the Excellent range, reflecting satisfaction with the security and safety measures implemented on campus. The lowest-rated indicator was "The institution provides adequate equipment, technology, and resources for employees to effectively perform their duties," which obtained a

composite mean of 4.11, interpreted as Very Good. While still favorable, this result points to some concerns regarding the adequacy of available tools and technologies needed to optimize teaching, research, and administrative efficiency.

Overall, the general assessment yielded a composite mean of 4.29, interpreted as Excellent. This shows that both faculty and non-academic staff agree that the physical work environment in HEIs in Manila is conducive to productivity, efficiency, and employee satisfaction. This finding underscores the importance of sustaining high standards in physical working conditions, as it significantly contributes to employee morale, motivation, and institutional effectiveness.

1.2 Social Environment

Table 2 Assessment of Social Work Environment

Indicators	Faculty		Non-Academic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. There is a positive and supportive working atmosphere among faculty, staff, and administrators.	4.80	E	4.32	E	4.56	E	1
2. Administrators or department heads provide clear expectations and constructive feedback	4.70	E	4.03	VG	4.37	E	4
3. Faculty and non-academic staff feel valued and respected by their colleagues, department heads, and administrators.	4.90	E	4.18	VG	4.54	E	2
4. There is effective communication within departments and across institutional units.	4.80	E	3.95	VG	4.38	E	3
5. Opportunities for teamwork, collaboration, and shared projects are provided.	4.50	E	3.85	VG	4.18	VG	5
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.80**	**E**	**4.32**	**E**	**4.56**	**E**	

As shown in Table 2, the assessment of the social work environment by both faculty and non-academic staff in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila yielded an overall composite mean of 4.56, verbally interpreted as Excellent. This indicates that respondents generally perceive a strong and positive social atmosphere within their institutions.

The highest-rated indicator was “There is a positive and supportive working atmosphere among faculty, staff, and administrators” with a composite mean of 4.56, ranked first. This result highlights that collegiality and interpersonal relations are strongly upheld, contributing to a supportive and cooperative academic community. Closely following this, “Faculty and non-academic staff feel valued and respected by their colleagues, department heads, and administrators” obtained a composite mean of 4.54, also rated Excellent. This emphasizes the importance of mutual respect and recognition as key drivers of organizational culture and employee morale.

Meanwhile, “There is effective communication within departments and across institutional units” received a composite mean of 4.38, interpreted as Excellent. This reflects the presence of functional communication channels that enable coordination in both academic and administrative operations. Similarly, “Administrators or department heads provide clear expectations and constructive feedback” garnered a composite mean of 4.37, also rated Excellent. While leadership communication is viewed positively, this slightly lower score suggests opportunities for improvement in ensuring consistent and constructive feedback across all levels.

The lowest-rated indicator was “Opportunities for teamwork, collaboration, and shared projects are provided”, with a composite mean of 4.18, interpreted as Very Good. This implies that while collaboration exists, HEIs may further strengthen institutional support for structured teamwork, cross-unit initiatives, and collaborative academic or administrative projects to fully maximize collective productivity.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue XI November 2025

Overall, the findings suggest that the social work environment in HEIs in Manila is largely favorable, fostering collegiality, respect, and effective communication. However, enhancing opportunities for structured collaboration and reinforcing consistent leadership feedback mechanisms could further improve employee engagement, organizational cohesion, and institutional performance.

1.3 Organizational Environment

Table 3 Assessment of Organizational Work Environment

Indicators	Faculty		NonAcademic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The institution's policies and procedures are clearly communicated and applied fairly to faculty and non-academic staff.	4.90	E	3.92	VG	4.41	E	1
2. The institution provides opportunities for professional growth, training, and	4.80	E	3.63	VG	4.22	E	5
development for both faculty and nonacademic staff.							
3. Faculty and non-academic staff perceive their work as meaningful and contributing to the institution's mission and success.	4.30	E	4.15	VG	4.23	E	4
4. The institution promotes work-life balance among faculty and non-academic staff	4.70	E	3.82	VG	4.26	E	2.5
5. The institution demonstrates a strong commitment to the overall well-being of faculty and non-academic staff.	4.70	E	3.82	VG	4.26	E	2.5
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.90**	**E**	**3.92**	**VG**	**4.41**	**E**	

As displayed in Table 3, both faculty and non-academic staff assessed the organizational work environment of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila as generally Excellent, with a composite mean of 4.41, verbally interpreted as Excellent. Faculty members consistently gave higher ratings, averaging 4.90, while non-academic staff rated it slightly lower at 3.92, still within the Very Good range. This difference suggests that although policies and organizational support are recognized, non-academic staff may experience challenges in how these are implemented at their level.

The highest-rated indicator was "The institution's policies and procedures are clearly communicated and applied fairly to faculty and non-academic staff," which received a composite mean of 4.41 and ranked first. This reflects strong confidence in fairness and transparency within the institution.

Both "The institution promotes work-life balance among faculty and non-academic staff" and "The institution demonstrates a strong commitment to the overall well-being of faculty and non-academic staff" shared the second rank, each with a composite mean of 4.26, interpreted as Excellent. These results highlight the importance given to employee welfare and balance between professional and personal life.

Meanwhile, "Faculty and non-academic staff perceive their work as meaningful and contributing to the institution's mission and success" obtained a composite mean of 4.23, also within the Excellent range. This indicates that employees generally recognize the significance of their roles in fulfilling institutional goals. The lowest-rated indicator was "The institution provides opportunities for professional growth, training, and development for both faculty and non-academic staff," with a composite mean of 4.22. While still interpreted as Excellent, this suggests a need for further enhancement of training programs and professional development initiatives.

Overall, the findings imply that the organizational work environment in HEIs in Manila is viewed positively, with strengths in fairness, well-being, and meaningful work. However, more accessible and structured

opportunities for professional growth would further enhance job satisfaction, employee engagement, and institutional effectiveness.

Table 4 Summary of the Assessment of the Work Environment

Variables	Faculty		NonAcademic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Physical Environment	4.72	E	3.86	VG	4.29	E	2
2. Social Environment	4.74	E	4.07	VG	4.41	E	1
3. Organizational Environment	4.68	E	3.87	VG	4.28	E	3
Overall Weighted Mean	4.71	E	3.93	VG	4.32	E	

As illustrated in Table 4, both faculty and non-academic staff provided favorable assessments of the work environment in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila, with an overall composite mean of 4.32, verbally interpreted as Excellent. Among the three dimensions, the Social Environment received the highest overall mean of 4.41, ranked first, suggesting that positive interpersonal relationships, effective communication, and supportive teamwork are strongly evident within HEIs. This was followed by the Physical Environment with a composite mean of 4.29, ranked second, and the Organizational Environment with a mean of 4.28, ranked third. Both were likewise interpreted as Excellent, reflecting a generally favorable perception of workplace conditions and institutional support.

Notably, faculty consistently gave higher ratings across all variables, with means ranging from 4.68 to 4.74, all within the Excellent range. In contrast, non-academic staff provided slightly lower ratings, ranging from 3.86 to 4.07, interpreted as Very Good. This indicates a perceptual difference between the two groups, with faculty viewing the work environment more positively than non-academic staff.

These findings imply that while the work environment in HEIs in Manila is generally perceived as conducive to productivity and satisfaction, a modest perception gap exists. The slightly lower ratings from nonacademic staff suggest areas for improvement, particularly in strengthening organizational policies, resource allocation, and support systems. Addressing these aspects may enhance inclusivity, job satisfaction, and engagement, thereby fostering a more balanced and cohesive academic community.

2. Is there a significant difference between the assessments of the two groups of respondents and the work environment in selected Higher Education Institutions in Manila?

Table 5 Test of Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Work Environment Between Faculty and Non-Academic Staff in Higher Education Institutions in Manila

Variables	Group	Mean	t-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Physical Environment	Faculty	4.72	2.35	0.0218	Reject H_0	Significant
	Non-Academic Staff	3.86				
Social Environment	Faculty	4.74	3.01	0.0036	Reject H_0	Significant
	Non-Academic Staff	4.07				
Organizational Environment	Faculty	4.68	2.64	0.0102	Reject H_0	Significant
	Non-Academic Staff	3.87				

Note: Independent Samples t-test, df = 68. Reject Ho if $p < 0.05$; otherwise, fail to reject.

As shown in Table 5, the results of the Independent Samples t-test reveal that there is a statistically significant difference between the assessments of faculty and non-academic staff on the physical, social, and organizational aspects of the work environment in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila.

For the physical environment, faculty reported a higher mean score of 4.72 compared to 3.86 from nonacademic staff. A similar trend was observed in the social environment, where faculty gave a mean score of 4.74, while non-academic staff rated it 4.07. Likewise, in the organizational environment, faculty assigned a mean score of 4.68 against 3.87 from non-academic staff. The computed t-values for all variables were statistically significant, with p-values below the 0.05 threshold, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis in each case.

These findings suggest that faculty generally perceive the work environment more positively than nonacademic staff across all dimensions. The consistent pattern of higher ratings among faculty may reflect differences in job roles, access to institutional support, or perceptions of professional value within HEIs. Conversely, the relatively lower scores from non-academic staff may highlight areas where institutional policies, resources, and support systems could be strengthened to ensure equity and inclusivity.

Overall, the results underscore the importance of addressing this perceptual gap to promote a more cohesive and supportive academic community. Efforts to align institutional practices with the needs and experiences of both faculty and non-academic staff may lead to improved job satisfaction, enhanced performance, and a stronger organizational culture.

3. How do the two groups of respondents assess the employee productivity in selected Higher Education Institutions in Manila?

3.1 Individual Productivity

Table 6 Assessment of Individual Employee Productivity by Faculty and Non-Academic Staff in Higher Education Institutions in Manila

Indicators	Faculty		NonAcademic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Faculty and non-academic staff are able to complete their tasks efficiently and effectively.	4.50	HE	4.45	HE	4.48	HE	2
2. Faculty and non-academic staff are motivated to perform their jobs to the best of their ability.	4.90	HE	4.02	E	4.46	HE	3
3. Faculty and non-academic staff perceive their workload as manageable.	4.60	HE	3.95	E	4.28	HE	4
4. Faculty and non-academic staff possess the necessary skills and knowledge to perform their jobs effectively.	4.70	HE	4.27	HE	4.49	HE	1
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.67**	**HE**	**4.17**	**E**	**4.42**	**HE**	

Legend:

Point	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
5	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Evident	HE
4	3.40 – 4.19	Evident	E
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Evident	ME
2	1.80 – 2.59	Least Evident	LE
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Least Evident	VLE

As shown in Table 6, the overall assessment of individual employee productivity by faculty and nonacademic staff in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila yielded a composite mean of 4.42, which is verbally interpreted as Highly Evident. This indicates that both groups generally recognize strong levels of efficiency, motivation, and competence in fulfilling their work responsibilities.

The highest-rated indicator was "Faculty and non-academic staff possess the necessary skills and knowledge to perform their jobs effectively," which ranked first with a composite mean of 4.49 (Highly Evident). This reflects a high level of professional competence and suggests that employees feel adequately equipped to perform their academic and administrative functions.

The second highest indicator was "Faculty and non-academic staff are able to complete their tasks efficiently and effectively" with a composite mean of 4.48 (Highly Evident), indicating consistent productivity and task accomplishment. Following this was "Faculty and non-academic staff are motivated to perform their jobs to the best of their ability" with a composite mean of 4.46 (Highly Evident), showing that employees are generally driven to deliver their best performance.

The lowest-rated indicator, though still in the Highly Evident range, was "Faculty and non-academic staff perceive their workload as manageable" with a composite mean of 4.28. This suggests that while employees remain effective and motivated, concerns about workload distribution and task allocation may affect long-term productivity and well-being.

These findings are consistent with Abun (2021), who emphasized the importance of self-efficacy and supportive environments in enhancing work performance. Likewise, Silud et al. (2024) highlighted that maintaining manageable workloads reduces stress and prevents burnout, thereby sustaining employee productivity. From an international perspective, Kurniawanto et al. (2022) noted that competence and motivation significantly influence performance when reinforced by organizational practices that promote balance and wellbeing. Hanafi and Syah (2021) further observed that employee motivation and satisfaction, when aligned with institutional support, lead to higher levels of productivity.

Overall, the results imply that faculty and non-academic staff in HEIs in Manila are skilled, capable, and motivated in their roles. However, attention to workload management is essential to maintain this high level of productivity and prevent the risk of fatigue or reduced job satisfaction over time.

3.2 Team Productivity

Table 7 Assessment of Team Employee Productivity by Faculty and Non-Academic Staff in Higher Education Institutions in Manila

Indicators	Faculty		NonAcademic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Faculty and non-academic staff teams work well together to achieve common academic and administrative goals	4.80	HE	4.13	E	4.47	HE	1
2. Faculty and non-academic staff teams are able to resolve conflicts effectively within their departments or units.	4.50	HE	3.98	E	4.24	HE	3
3. Faculty and non-academic staff teams meet or exceed performance expectations in fulfilling institutional responsibilities.	4.70	HE	3.88	E	4.29	HE	2
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.67**	**HE**	**4.00**	**E**	**4.34**	**HE**	

As shown in Table 7, the overall assessment of team employee productivity by faculty and non-academic staff in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila yielded a composite mean of 4.34, which is verbally interpreted as Highly Evident. This finding indicates that teamwork, collaboration, and collective performance are generally strong in academic and administrative units.

The highest-rated indicator was "Faculty and non-academic staff teams work well together to achieve common academic and administrative goals" with a composite mean of 4.47 (Highly Evident), ranked first. This underscores the importance of shared objectives and effective collaboration in advancing institutional goals, such as academic quality, research outputs, and efficient service delivery.

The second highest indicator was "Faculty and non-academic staff teams meet or exceed performance expectations in fulfilling institutional responsibilities" with a composite mean of 4.29 (Highly Evident). This suggests that teams in HEIs are able to meet performance benchmarks and uphold institutional standards in teaching, research, and administrative support.

The lowest-rated indicator, though still rated as Highly Evident, was "Faculty and non-academic staff teams are able to resolve conflicts effectively within their departments or units" with a composite mean of 4.24. This implies that while conflict resolution practices exist, there is still room for improvement in managing disagreements or misunderstandings, particularly across diverse academic and administrative roles.

These results highlight that teamwork is a strong asset within HEIs in Manila, supported by collegiality, shared responsibilities, and alignment with institutional missions. However, the slightly lower rating for conflict resolution indicates that fostering structured mechanisms such as mediation, open dialogue, and team-building programs may further enhance team productivity and cohesion.

From the literature, Abun (2021) emphasized that collaborative work dynamics significantly enhance organizational performance by building trust and synergy among employees. Similarly, Silud et al. (2024) noted that effective conflict management and communication systems are crucial for sustaining team productivity in academic settings. On an international perspective, Kurniawanto et al. (2022) also stressed that teamwork and organizational support jointly improve institutional efficiency, while Hanafi and Syah (2021) observed that conflict resolution skills contribute directly to overall team performance outcomes.

In sum, teamwork among faculty and non-academic staff in HEIs in Manila is perceived as productive, collaborative, and aligned with institutional objectives, though further strengthening of conflict resolution strategies may optimize long-term effectiveness.

Table 8 Summary of the Assessment of Employee Productivity by Faculty and Non-Academic Staff in Higher Education Institutions in Manila

Indicators	Faculty		Non-Academic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Individual Productivity	4.67	HE	4.17	E	4.42	HE	1
2. Team Productivity	4.67	HE	4.00	E	4.34	HE	2
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.67**	**HE**	**4.09**	**E**	**4.38**	**HE**	

As summarized in Table 8, both faculty and non-academic staff assessed employee productivity in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila as generally Highly Evident, with an overall composite mean of 4.38.

Between the two dimensions, Individual Productivity ranked first with a composite mean of 4.42, while Team Productivity followed closely with a mean of 4.34. This finding suggests that respondents place slightly greater emphasis on individual efficiency, motivation, and competence compared to collective team dynamics.

Faculty consistently provided higher ratings across both dimensions, with identical means of 4.67 (Highly Evident) for both individual and team productivity, indicating strong confidence in their own and their peers' contributions to institutional goals. In contrast, non-academic staff rated individual productivity at 4.17 (Evident) and team productivity slightly lower at 4.00 (Evident), showing a more moderate but still favorable perception.

The disparity between faculty and non-academic staff ratings may reflect differences in role expectations and work experiences. Faculty members, who often exercise greater autonomy in teaching, research, and academic decision-making, may view productivity—both individual and team-based as more strongly manifested. Non-academic staff, however, may encounter structural or resource-related challenges that slightly affect their perception of productivity, particularly in team contexts.

These results imply that employee productivity in HEIs is generally strong, driven by high individual performance and supported by functional teamwork. However, the slightly lower assessment of team productivity by non-

academic staff suggests the need for initiatives that foster stronger collaboration, communication, and conflict resolution across departments. Enhancing these areas could further align individual contributions with institutional goals, ultimately improving organizational effectiveness.

4. Is there a significant relationship between the work environment and employee productivity?

Table 9 Test of Significant Relationship Between Work Environment and Employee Productivity in terms of Individual Productivity

Variables	r-value	Strength of Relationship	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Physical Environment	0.749	High Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_0	Significant
Social Environment	0.697	High Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_0	Significant
Organizational Environment	0.764	High Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_0	Significant

Note: The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used at a 0.05 level of significance. If the pvalue is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. The strength of correlation is interpreted as follows: 0.80– 0.99: very high, 0.60–0.79: high, 0.40–0.59: moderate, 0.10–0.39: low, and 0.01–0.09: negligible.

As showcased in Table 9, the findings reveal a high and statistically significant correlation between the work environment and individual employee productivity. Among the three dimensions assessed, the organizational environment yielded the highest correlation coefficient of 0.764, indicating that policies, training opportunities, and employee well-being initiatives have a strong influence on productivity. The physical environment followed with a correlation of 0.749, suggesting that cleanliness, safety, and availability of necessary resources are also crucial in supporting employees' efficiency. Lastly, the social environment registered a correlation of 0.697, underscoring the importance of positive interpersonal relationships, communication, and teamwork within the workplace. Since all p-values were less than 0.0001, the null hypotheses were rejected, confirming that these relationships are statistically significant. These results imply that a well-structured and supportive work environment plays a vital role in enhancing the individual performance of employees in Higher Education Institutions in Manila.

Table 10 Test of Significant Relationship Between Work Environment and Employee Productivity in terms of Team Productivity

Variables	r-value	Strength of Relationship	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Physical Environment	0.837	Very High Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_0	Significant
Social Environment	0.872	Very High Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_0	Significant
Organizational Environment	0.874	Very High Correlation	<.0001	Reject H_0	Significant

As shown in Table 10, the results reveal a high and statistically significant correlation between the work environment and individual productivity among faculty and non-academic staff in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila.

Among the three dimensions, the organizational environment obtained the highest correlation coefficient of 0.764, indicating that policies, fair procedures, opportunities for professional growth, and institutional support for employee well-being exert a strong influence on how effectively faculty and staff perform their individual tasks. This suggests that when institutions demonstrate fairness and provide avenues for development, employees are more likely to sustain high productivity levels.

The physical environment followed with a correlation of 0.749, highlighting that the availability of well maintained facilities, safe and secure workplaces, and adequate resources such as technology and equipment are critical to enabling employees to work efficiently and effectively.

The social environment yielded a correlation of 0.697, still within the high correlation range. This underscores the importance of collegiality, mutual respect, communication, and teamwork in fostering a climate where faculty and non-academic staff can maximize their individual productivity.

Since all p-values were <.0001, the null hypothesis was rejected across all dimensions, confirming that the relationships are statistically significant. These findings emphasize that a well-structured, supportive, and inclusive work environment significantly enhances the capacity of employees in HEIs to accomplish their tasks effectively. Institutions that invest in organizational fairness, adequate resources, and positive interpersonal dynamics are more likely to achieve sustainable productivity gains from both academic and non-academic personnel.

5. What are the problems encountered relative to the work environment and employee productivity?

Table 11 Assessment of Problems Encountered Relative to the Work Environment and Employee Productivity in Higher Education Institutions in Manila

Indicators	Faculty		NonAcademic Staff		Composite Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Inadequate lighting and poor ventilation negatively affect comfort, concentration, and overall work performance	3.10	ME	3.05	ME	**3.08**	ME	6
2. Noise disturbances disrupt communication, teaching, and administrative focus	3.05	ME	3.62	E	**3.34**	ME	5
3. Overcrowded offices and workspaces hinder efficiency and effective workflow	3.15	ME	3.18	ME	**3.17**	ME	7
4. Limited opportunities for professional training and development reduce employee growth and competence	3.20	ME	3.25	ME	**3.23**	ME	8
5. Poor communication and ineffective supervision from administrators and department heads weaken staff motivation and productivity.	3.40	E	3.45	E	**3.43**	E	2
6. Insufficient resources and outdated equipment constrain academic and administrative efficiency.	3.30	ME	3.40	E	**3.35**	ME	4
7. Excessive workload and understaffing contribute to stress, fatigue, and employee burnout.	3.60	E	3.90	E	**3.75**	E	1
8. Concerns over workplace safety and security lower employee morale and hinder productivity.	2.60	ME	2.50	LE	**2.55**	LE	9
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.30**	ME	**3.42**	E	**3.35**	ME	

Legend:

Point	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Symbol
5	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Encountered	HE
4	3.40 – 4.19	Encountered	E
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Encountered	ME
2	1.80 – 2.59	Least Encountered	LE
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Least Encountered	VLE

As established in Table 11, both faculty and non-academic staff identified a range of moderately to highly encountered problems affecting the work environment and employee productivity in higher education institutions in Manila. The overall weighted mean of 3.36, verbally interpreted as Moderately Encountered, suggests that while the issues are not extremely severe, they are consistently present and influence the overall workplace conditions.

The most prominent problem, ranked first, was excessive workload and understaffing, with a composite mean of 3.75, verbally interpreted as Encountered. This indicates a serious concern that contributes to stress, fatigue, and employee burnout, thereby directly reducing productivity and work quality.

Poor communication and ineffective supervision from administrators and department heads emerged as the second most pressing issue, with a composite mean of 3.43 (Encountered). This highlights how leadership and communication strongly shape staff motivation, collaboration, and overall institutional performance.

Insufficient resources and outdated equipment, ranked third with a composite mean of 3.35 (Moderately Encountered), also constrained teaching, research, and administrative functions, emphasizing the importance of modernizing institutional support systems. Noise disturbances (3.34) and inadequate lighting and ventilation (3.08) were likewise rated as persistent workplace challenges that affect focus and comfort.

On the other hand, the problem least encountered was concerns over workplace safety and security, with a composite mean of 2.55, verbally interpreted as Least Encountered. This suggests that while safety issues exist in certain contexts, they are not a widespread challenge across institutions.

In summary, the findings reveal that the problems encountered by both faculty and non-academic staff are a combination of workload pressures, managerial shortcomings, and environmental limitations. Although none reached the highest severity level, their consistent presence signals the need for targeted interventions particularly in workload distribution, supervisory practices, and resource allocation to improve overall productivity and employee well-being in higher education institutions.

Interview Results

The interviews with selected faculty members, non-academic staff, and administrators provided rich qualitative insights into the work environment and employee productivity in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Participants consistently emphasized that employees possess strong foundational competencies, particularly in task completion, collaboration, and professional responsibility. Faculty members described themselves as "efficient in preparing lessons and delivering instruction," while staff noted that they "ensure records and documents are processed on time," demonstrating reliability and commitment. These observations reinforce prior studies underscoring the importance of employee competence and teamwork in sustaining institutional productivity (Abun et al., 2021; Silud et al., 2024).

Despite these strengths, employees identified several persistent challenges that hinder optimal productivity. A major concern was excessive workload and understaffing, with faculty reporting heavy teaching responsibilities compounded by administrative tasks, and staff often performing multiple roles due to limited manpower. As one respondent noted, "The number of responsibilities we handle is beyond what one person can manage effectively." This concern aligns with existing literature linking workload strain and resource constraints to burnout and diminished efficiency in HEIs (Kurniawanto et al., 2022; Hanafi & Syah, 2021).

Issues surrounding communication and leadership effectiveness also emerged prominently. Faculty cited unclear or inconsistent instructions from administrators, while non-academic staff highlighted irregular policy implementation and insufficient supervisory guidance. One participant shared, "Sometimes we receive conflicting instructions, which causes confusion and delays." These experiences echo studies demonstrating that effective leadership and clear communication enhance morale, coordination, and overall productivity (Nguyen et al., 2023; Villanueva et al., 2024).

Employees also identified insufficient resources and outdated equipment as barriers to efficiency. Faculty emphasized the need for modern teaching technologies, while staff described how obsolete office tools hinder administrative processes. Such concerns affirm research indicating that adequate facilities and updated resources are fundamental to high-quality academic and administrative performance (Garcia & Santiago, 2024; Castillo et al., 2025).

Finally, respondents expressed concern over limited professional development opportunities. Many faculty and staff voiced a desire for more training, seminars, and workshops to enhance skills and remain competitive. As one faculty member remarked, "We want to update our skills, but training opportunities are rarely provided." This observation supports literature emphasizing the critical role of continuous learning in sustaining productivity and innovation in HEIs (Rahman et al., 2022; Lopez & Dela Cruz, 2025).

Thematic Analysis

A deeper thematic analysis of the interview data revealed four overarching themes that provide stronger qualitative grounding and highlight underlying structural influences on employee experiences:

1. Demonstrated Competence and Professional Commitment. Employees across all roles expressed strong dedication to fulfilling academic and administrative responsibilities. Their commitment to task completion, collaboration, and institutional service reflects a professional culture that supports productivity and aligns with institutional mission.
2. Workload Strain and Structural Staffing Constraints. Participants described chronic workload pressures driven by systemic issues such as insufficient plantilla positions, funding limitations, and organizational norms that require multitasking. These structural constraints produce persistent overload and risk of burnout for both faculty and non-academic staff.
3. Leadership and Communication Challenges. The data revealed recurring concerns about inconsistent communication, unclear expectations, and limited feedback from administrators. These issues are symptomatic of deeper organizational culture challenges, such as hierarchical leadership styles and uneven policy implementation, which can impede coordination and reduce motivation.
4. Resource Limitations and Restricted Professional Development. Respondents noted outdated equipment, insufficient teaching tools, and limited institutional support for training and skills enhancement. Structural barriers—including slow procurement processes and budgetary constraints further limit access to essential resources and inhibit employee growth and adaptability.

Overall, the interview data complement the survey results by illustrating that, although HEI employees exhibit high competence, commitment, and professionalism, their productivity is undermined by several structural organizational factors. These include restrictive workplace policies, leadership and communication shortcomings, inadequate resource systems, and limited opportunities for professional development. Addressing these deeper systemic issues is essential for creating a more supportive, equitable, and productive institutional environment.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study reveal that employees in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Manila generally perceive their work environment as favorable. The social environment emerged as the strongest dimension, characterized by collegiality, effective communication, and mutual respect among colleagues. Positive assessments of the physical and organizational environments further indicate that institutions provide conditions conducive to productive academic and administrative work. Employee productivity was also rated highly, particularly in terms of competence, efficiency, and teamwork, demonstrating that faculty and non-academic staff are capable of meeting institutional demands despite existing challenges.

However, the results also highlight important disparities between faculty and non-academic staff. Faculty consistently assigned higher ratings across all dimensions of the work environment and productivity, suggesting differences in role expectations, access to support, and perceived institutional value. These perceptual gaps point to inequities in workload distribution, communication flow, and resource allocation. Correlation analyses further showed that the organizational environment particularly institutional policies, leadership practices, and opportunities for professional development has the strongest influence on employee productivity. This underscores the critical role of administrative structures in shaping employee performance and overall institutional effectiveness.

Despite the generally positive perceptions, several challenges persist. Concerns related to excessive workload, inconsistent communication, inadequate resources, and limited professional development opportunities were evident in both survey responses and interview accounts. Nevertheless, issues related to workplace safety and basic operational support were minimal, indicating that HEIs maintain a stable institutional foundation. Improving workload distribution, strengthening leadership communication, and enhancing resource allocation are therefore essential strategies for fostering a more supportive and equitable work environment.

Insights from the thematic analysis reinforce these findings by revealing that productivity concerns arise not only from daily operational issues but also from deeper structural conditions. Outdated equipment, unclear supervisory practices, gaps in communication, and constrained access to training reflect systemic institutional challenges rather than isolated problems. Addressing these structural factors is essential for advancing employee well-being, enhancing adaptability, and promoting a more effective and sustainable institutional environment.

In summary, employees in HEIs demonstrate strong commitment, competence, and readiness to fulfill academic and administrative responsibilities. By implementing targeted interventions such as improving leadership practices, updating institutional resources, promoting equitable workload systems, and strengthening professional development HEIs can significantly enhance productivity, organizational cohesion, and long-term institutional performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. The administrators and department heads may implement structured workload management policies that include task prioritization, equitable redistribution of responsibilities, and the hiring of additional personnel where needed. These measures will help reduce excessive workload, prevent burnout, and promote balanced role allocation for both faculty and non-academic staff.
2. The leadership teams and supervisors may undergo training focused on communication clarity, consistency of directives, and participatory governance. Strengthening supervisory practices through clear expectations, regular feedback, and open consultation meetings will improve motivation, coordination, and overall institutional climate.
3. The Institutions may allocate resources for modernizing facilities, upgrading office equipment, and enhancing instructional technologies. Strategic budgeting, streamlined procurement processes, and prioritization of essential academic and administrative tools are necessary to ensure operational efficiency and high-quality service delivery.
4. Human resource units and academic offices should design and implement continuous, equitable professional development opportunities—including workshops, seminars, and skill-focused training to support employee growth, adaptability, and long-term productivity across all units.
5. Administrators may examine existing policies to remove structural barriers that hinder workplace efficiency. This includes addressing outdated procedures, hierarchical bottlenecks, and unclear supervisory systems to foster a more transparent, inclusive, and responsive organizational environment.
6. Institutions may adopt continuous feedback systems such as regular consultation meetings, periodic communication audits, and structured policy-review cycles. These mechanisms will help identify emerging issues, monitor workplace satisfaction, and ensure that institutional support systems remain aligned with employee needs.
7. Future evaluations of the work environment and employee productivity may adopt refined survey instruments, incorporating expanded Likert-scale options, reverse-coded items, and behaviorally anchored indicators. These measures will reduce inflated responses, enhance data sensitivity, and yield more accurate insights into employee experiences.

REFERENCES

1. Abun, J. P. (2021). Enhancing employee productivity through self-efficacy and supportive work environments. Journal of Educational Management Research, 15(2), 45-59.
2. Campbell, D. (2020). Sampling techniques in organizational research: Ensuring validity and reliability. New York, NY: Academic Press.
3. Castillo, R., Gomez, L., & Santos, E. (2025). Modernizing resources in higher education institutions:
4. Implications for efficiency and service quality. International Journal of Educational Development, 88, 102450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.102450

5. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500
6. Garcia, M., & Santiago, P. (2024). Institutional support and employee efficiency: A study in Philippine higher education. Philippine Journal of Educational Administration, 19(1), 15-30.
7. Hanafi, A., & Syah, R. (2021). Employee motivation and performance in academic institutions: An Indonesian perspective. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 9(3), 112-126.
8. Kurniawanto, A., Dewi, F., & Santoso, H. (2022). Competence, motivation, and performance in higher education: Evidence from Southeast Asia. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 44(5), 589-604. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2022.2084921
9. Lopez, C., & Dela Cruz, F. (2025). Continuous professional development in Philippine HEIs: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Academic Innovation, 7(1), 77-92.
10. Nguyen, T., Pham, H., & Le, K. (2023). Leadership and communication in higher education: Effects on staff motivation. International Journal of Educational Leadership, 28(4), 211-230.
11. Nikolopoulou, K. (2023). Purposive sampling in educational research: Rationale and applications. Educational Research Review, 18(2), 56-71.
12. Rahman, S., Ali, M., & Tan, C. (2022). Professional development and employee productivity in universities. Asia-Pacific Education Review, 23(3), 421-435.
13. Silud, P., Morales, J., & Reyes, L. (2024). Workload management and employee efficiency in Philippine higher education. Philippine Journal of Human Resource Management, 12(2), 33-48.
14. Villanueva, R., Santos, J., & Cruz, P. (2024). Communication gaps and employee productivity: Evidence from universities. Journal of Organizational Studies, 31(2), 145-162.