

Engagement, Physical Activity, and Workload: Implications on the Perceived Effects of the Local Government Unit's Wellness Program

¹Kimberly B. Flores, MAEd-TPE, ²Oliver Napila Gomez, PhD

¹Lourdes College, Inc. Graduate School

²Mindanao State University – Maigo College of Education, Science and Technology

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1315PH00119>

Received: 25 May 2026; Accepted: 30 May 2026; Published: 22 June 2026

ABSTRACT

Employee wellness programs have become essential strategies for promoting well-being and sustaining productivity, particularly in public-sector organizations where workloads and service demands are persistent. This study examined the relationships among engagement in the wellness program, physical activity level, workload, and the perceived effects of the wellness program among employees of a Local Government Unit (LGU) in Bukidnon, Philippines. Guided by Social Exchange Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and the Job Demands–Resources framework, the study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational design. A total of 194 LGU employees were selected through random sampling and completed structured self-report questionnaires measuring cognitive, affective, and behavioral engagement, physical activity level, workload, and perceived program effects. Descriptive statistics, Pearson product–moment correlation, and multiple linear regression were used to analyze the data. Results showed that employees demonstrated high engagement, moderate physical activity, and moderate workload. The wellness program was perceived to have strong positive effects across physical health, mental well-being, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and social connectedness. Correlation analysis revealed a strong, positive, and significant relationship between engagement and perceived program effects, as well as a moderate significant association between workload and perceived effects. In contrast, physical activity level was not significantly associated with perceived program effects. Multiple regression analysis confirmed that engagement and workload jointly accounted for approximately 63% of the variance in perceived program effects, with engagement emerging as the strongest predictor, whereas physical activity level was not a significant contributor. The findings indicate that employees' perceptions of wellness programs are shaped more by organizational engagement and work context than by individual activity behaviors. The study highlights the importance of engagement-driven and workload-sensitive wellness strategies in public-sector institutions.

Keywords: employee wellness, engagement, workload, physical activity, LGU employees, workplace well-being

INTRODUCTION

Employee wellness programs have become increasingly important in contemporary organizations as mechanisms for promoting workforce well-being, sustaining productivity, and enhancing organizational outcomes. In public-sector institutions such as Local Government Units (LGUs), where employees face persistent administrative demands and service pressures, the need to support physical, mental, and social well-being is particularly critical (Calapre et al., 2024; Duffy et al., 2024). Workplace wellness initiatives are thus implemented not only as health interventions but also as strategic organizational tools aimed at fostering engagement, motivation, and overall job satisfaction. However, despite their growing adoption, the effectiveness of these programs depends largely on how they are experienced and evaluated by employees within their specific work contexts.

Globally, studies have documented the potential of wellness programs to improve physical health, psychological well-being, and organizational commitment, particularly when employees actively participate in these initiatives

(Duffy et al., 2024; Reif et al., 2020). Nevertheless, evidence also shows variability in program outcomes across organizational settings. Differences in employee engagement, motivational dynamics, and contextual constraints—such as workload and time pressure—often shape how wellness programs are perceived and whether their intended benefits are realized (Chawla et al., 2022). These inconsistencies suggest that wellness programs cannot be evaluated solely based on their availability or structure, but must be examined in relation to the organizational and behavioral conditions in which they operate.

Within the Philippine context, particularly in LGUs, employees commonly experience moderate to high workload demands, administrative complexity, and limited opportunities for sustained physical activity (Calapre et al., 2024). Local studies further indicate that engagement in wellness initiatives is often selective and inconsistent, while physical activity tends to be moderate and largely incidental rather than structured (Balingcasag et al., 2025; Concepcion et al., 2024). At the same time, wellness programs are generally perceived positively, contributing to aspects such as mental well-being, job satisfaction, and social connectedness. These observations highlight that employees' perceptions of wellness programs are shaped not only by individual behaviors but also by their level of engagement and the broader work environment in which these programs are embedded.

Despite the growing body of literature, a clear gap remains in the integration of key variables influencing wellness program outcomes. Existing studies tend to examine engagement, physical activity, and workload independently, with limited attempts to analyze their combined influence on employees' perceived program effects, particularly in Philippine LGU settings (Chawla et al., 2022; Reif et al., 2020). Moreover, there is insufficient emphasis on subjective evaluations of wellness programs, which are essential for understanding how employees interpret program effectiveness within real-world organizational contexts. This gap underscores the need for a more comprehensive and context-specific investigation that captures the interplay of behavioral and organizational factors in shaping wellness program perceptions.

Responding to these gaps, the present study examines the relationships among engagement in wellness programs, physical activity level, workload, and the perceived effects of wellness programs among LGU employees in Bukidnon. Grounded in Social Exchange Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and the Job Demands–Resources framework, the study aims to provide an integrated understanding of how organizational participation, individual behavior, and work demands influence employees' evaluation of wellness initiatives. By focusing on perceived outcomes such as physical health, mental well-being, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and social connectedness, the study contributes both theoretically and empirically to the literature while offering practical insights for improving wellness program implementation in public-sector organizations.

This study aimed to analyze the relationship of engagement in a wellness program, physical activity level, and workload with perceived effects of the LGU wellness program. This study specifically sought the answers to the following research questions:

1. What is the level of the participants' engagement in the wellness program?
2. What is the physical activity level of the participants?
3. How do the participants rate their workload?
4. What is the perceived effect of the LGU's wellness program for the participants?
5. Is there a significant relationship between participants' engagement in the wellness program, physical activity level, and workload and the perceived effects of the LGU's wellness program?
6. Do participants' engagement in the wellness program, physical activity level, and workload significantly predict the perceived effects of the LGU's wellness program when considered together?

Moreover, based on the foregoing research questions, the following null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance. The first three were tested using Pearson product–moment correlation, and the fourth using multiple linear regression.

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between engagement in the wellness program and the perceived effects of the LGU’s wellness program.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between physical activity level and the perceived effects of the LGU’s wellness program.

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between workload and the perceived effects of the LGU’s wellness program.

Ho₄: Engagement in the wellness program, physical activity level, and workload do not significantly predict the perceived effects of the LGU’s wellness program when considered together.

METHODS

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design to examine the relationships among engagement in the wellness program, physical activity level, workload, and the perceived effects of the LGU wellness program. This design is appropriate for describing variables and determining the strength and direction of relationships among them as they naturally occur, without manipulation of conditions. Although it does not establish causality, it allows for the systematic examination of associations within real-world organizational contexts.

The participants were employees from a Local Government Unit (LGU) in Bukidnon, Philippines, with a total population of 388 personnel across employment categories. Using the Raosoft sample size calculator with a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level, a minimum sample of 194 respondents was determined. Participants were selected through random sampling using an employee list obtained from the Human Resource Management Office. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was secured prior to data collection.

Four instruments were used to gather data. Engagement in the wellness program was measured using a researcher-developed 15-item questionnaire covering cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions (Duffy et al., 2024; Santoso, 2024). Physical activity level was assessed using the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ), developed by Armstrong and Bull (2006) and endorsed by the World Health Organization for physical activity surveillance. Workload was measured using the Quantitative Workload Inventory (Spector & Jex, 1998). The perceived effects of the LGU wellness program were measured using a researcher-developed 20-item scale covering physical health, mental well-being, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and social connectedness (Calapre et al., 2024; Duffy et al., 2024).

The researcher-developed instruments underwent expert content validation and pilot testing prior to the main data collection. Reliability analysis using Cronbach’s alpha indicated very good to good internal consistency across all constructs, with coefficients of 0.956 for engagement, 0.953 for perceived effects, 0.888 for workload, and 0.952 for physical activity, all exceeding the recommended threshold of $\alpha \geq 0.70$.

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Lourdes College Research Ethics Committee prior to data collection. Participants were provided with informed consent forms and were assured of voluntary participation, confidentiality, and their right to withdraw at any time. The study adhered to the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report, including respect for persons, beneficence, and justice (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1979).

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, to determine the levels of the study variables. Pearson product–moment correlation was used to examine the relationships among engagement, physical activity, workload, and perceived program effects. Multiple linear regression was subsequently conducted to determine the extent to which engagement in the wellness program,

workload, and physical activity level jointly predicted the perceived effects of the LGU wellness program, with perceived effects as the dependent variable. Regression assumptions, including linearity, normality of residuals, homoscedasticity, and independence of residuals (Durbin–Watson = 1.88), were examined prior to interpretation. Multicollinearity was not considered a concern given the low intercorrelations among the predictor variables. Statistical significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$, with all analyses conducted at a 95% confidence level.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the level of participants' involvement in the LGU wellness program across three dimensions—cognitive, affective, and behavioral engagement. The findings indicate that employees demonstrated high overall engagement ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.66$). Among the three dimensions, cognitive engagement obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.69$), followed by affective engagement ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.70$) and behavioral engagement ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.75$), all interpreted as high engagement. In terms of distribution, the majority of participants fell under the High (57.22%) and Very High (34.02%) engagement categories, indicating that most employees reported strong involvement in the wellness program. Only a small proportion reported moderate or low engagement, while very low engagement was almost absent.

Table 1 Level of Participants' Involvement in the LGU Wellness Program in Terms of Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Engagement

Range		Interpretation	Cognitive		Affective		Behavioral		Overall	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
4.51	– 5.00	Very High Engagement	82	42.27	67	34.54	61	31.44	66	34.02
3.51	– 4.50	High Engagement	96	49.48	108	55.67	95	48.97	111	57.22
2.51	– 3.50	Moderate Engagement	6	3.09	9	4.64	32	16.49	6	3.09
1.51	– 2.50	Low Engagement	10	5.15	8	4.12	6	3.09	11	5.67
1.00	– 1.50	Very Low Engagement	0	0.00	2	1.03	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL			194	100	194	100	194	100	194	100
Mean			4.25		4.19		4.09		4.18	
Interpretation			High Engagement		High Engagement		High Engagement		High Engagement	
SD			0.69		0.70		0.75		0.66	

Table 2 presents the physical activity level of the participants across three domains assessed using the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire: physical activity at work or study, physical activity during travel, and recreational physical activity. The results indicate that participants demonstrated an overall moderate level of physical activity ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.62$). Across domains, physical activity at work or study ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.76$), travel-related physical activity ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.73$), and recreational physical activity ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.66$) were all interpreted as moderate. In terms of distribution, the majority of participants fell within the moderate activity category (61.86%), followed by those in the high activity category (25.77%). Only a small proportion reported very high levels of physical activity, indicating that sustained high-intensity activity is uncommon among employees.

Table 2 Physical Activity Level of the Participants in Terms of Work/Study, Travel, and Recreational Domains

Range		Interpretation	PA at Work or Study		PA During Travel		Recreational PA		Overall	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
4.51	– 5.00	Very High	4	2.06	9	4.64	4	2.06	0	0
3.51	– 4.50	High	41	21.13	72	37.11	46	23.71	50	25.77
2.51	– 3.50	Moderate	78	40.21	83	42.78	101	52.06	120	61.86
1.51	– 2.50	Low	69	35.57	28	14.43	42	21.65	23	11.86
1.00	– 1.50	Very Low	2	1.03	2	1.03	1	0.52	1	0.52
TOTAL			194	100	194	100	194	100	194	100
Mean			3.01		3.35		3.19		3.19	
Interpretation			Moderate		Moderate		Moderate		Moderate	
SD			0.76		0.73		0.66		0.62	

Table 3 presents the participants perceived workload as measured using the Quantitative Workload Inventory (QWI). The results indicate that employees generally experienced a moderate level of workload (M = 3.30, SD = 0.86). Although the overall interpretation falls within the moderate range, the largest proportion of respondents reported a heavy workload (39.69%), followed by those who reported moderate workload (34.02%). Only a small percentage of participants indicated very heavy workload (6.19%), and none reported very light workload, suggesting that work demands are consistently present across the LGU workforce.

Table 3. Participants' Workload Level Based on the Quantitative Workload Inventory

Range		Interpretation	Workload	
			f	%
4.51	– 5.00	Very Heavy Workload	12	6.19
3.51	– 4.50	Heavy Workload	77	39.69
2.51	– 3.50	Moderate Workload	66	34.02
1.51	– 2.50	Light Workload	39	20.10
1.00	– 1.50	Very Light Workload	0	0
TOTAL			194	100
Mean			3.30	
Interpretation			Moderate Workload	
SD			0.86	

Table 4 presents the summary distribution and descriptive statistics of participants' perceived effects of the LGU wellness program across five domains: physical health, mental well-being, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and social connectedness. Overall, the results indicate that employees reported a strong perceived

effect of the wellness program ($M = 4.19, SD = 0.63$). The majority of participants fell under the strong (61.34%) and very strong (30.93%) categories, suggesting that the program is widely regarded as beneficial and meaningful within the LGU work environment. Only a small proportion of respondents reported moderate, weak, or very weak perceived effects. Across the five domains, all were interpreted as having strong perceived effects. Physical health obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.23, SD = 0.65$), followed closely by mental well-being ($M = 4.22, SD = 0.70$) and social connectedness ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.74$). Job satisfaction ($M = 4.16, SD = 0.74$) and organizational commitment ($M = 4.11, SD = 0.76$) also registered strong perceived effects, indicating that the wellness program contributes not only to individual health outcomes but also to positive organizational attitudes and relationships.

Table 4 Participants' Perceived Effect of the LGU's Wellness Program in Terms of Physical Health, Mental Well-Being, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Social Connectedness

Domain	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Very Strong (%)	Strong (%)	Moderate (%)	Weak (%)	Very Weak (%)
Physical Health	4.23	0.65	Strong Perceived Effect	34.54	51.03	11.86	2.58	0.00
Mental Well-Being	4.22	0.70	Strong Perceived Effect	32.99	54.64	8.76	2.06	1.55
Job Satisfaction	4.16	0.74	Strong Perceived Effect	29.38	55.15	11.86	1.55	2.06
Organizational Commitment	4.11	0.76	Strong Perceived Effect	26.80	55.15	13.40	2.58	2.06
Social Connectedness	4.20	0.74	Strong Perceived Effect	29.38	60.31	5.67	2.58	2.06
Overall	4.19	0.63	Strong Perceived Effect	30.93	61.34	4.12	2.06	1.55

In Table 5, the correlation analysis indicates that engagement in the wellness program has a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship with the perceived effects of the LGU wellness program ($r = 0.785, p < .001$), suggesting that higher engagement is associated with more favorable program evaluations. Workload also shows a moderate positive and significant relationship ($r = 0.373, p < .001$), implying that employees with greater work demands tend to report stronger perceived effects. In contrast, physical activity level demonstrates a weak and non-significant relationship ($r = -0.069, p = 0.342$), indicating that variations in physical activity are not associated with differences in perceived program outcomes.

Table 5 Correlation of Engagement, Physical Activity, and Workload with Perceived Effects

Variable	r	p
Engagement in Wellness Program	0.785**	< .001
Level of Physical Activity	-0.069	0.342
Workload	0.373**	< .001

Note. r = Pearson's correlation coefficient; p = probability value; N = 194.

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Additionally, Table 6 shows the regression analysis reveals that the combined predictors significantly influence the perceived effects of the LGU wellness program, as evidenced by a statistically significant model ($F(3,190) = 106.17, p < .001$) explaining 62.6% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.626$). Among the predictors, engagement in the wellness program is the strongest and most significant contributor ($\beta = 0.740, p < .001$), followed by workload, which has a smaller but significant effect ($\beta = 0.115, p = 0.023$). Conversely, physical activity level is not a significant predictor ($\beta = -0.040, p = 0.399$). Overall, the findings suggest that engagement and workload play meaningful roles in shaping employees' perceptions of wellness program effectiveness, whereas physical activity does not significantly contribute when considered alongside these variables.

Table 6 Regression Analysis of the Influence of Engagement in Wellness Program, Workload, and Level of Physical Activity on Perceived Effects of LGU Wellness Program

Predictor	B	SE	β	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	t	p
Constant	1.072*	0.240	—	0.601	1.543	4.459	<.001
Engagement in Wellness Program	0.709*	0.047	0.740	0.616	0.802	15.214	<.001
Workload	0.085*	0.037	0.115	0.012	0.158	2.287	0.023
Level of Physical Activity	-0.041	0.048	-0.040	-0.135	0.053	-0.845	0.399

Model Summary
 $R = 0.791$ $R^2 = 0.626$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.620$ $F(3,190) = 106.17^*$ $p < .001$

B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardized beta coefficient; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; t = t statistic; p = probability value. Significant at the 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.

Model Equation
 $P = 1.072 + 0.709E + 0.085W - 0.041L$

Legend: P = Perceived Effects of LGU Wellness Program; E = Engagement in Wellness Program; W = Workload; L = Level of Physical Activity

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide a coherent picture of how LGU employees experience and evaluate wellness programs within a public-sector context. Overall, participants demonstrated high engagement, moderate physical activity, moderate workload, and strong perceived program effects, suggesting that wellness initiatives are positively received despite the demands of the work environment. This pattern reinforces the view that wellness programs in LGUs function as meaningful organizational mechanisms that support both employee well-being and workplace climate. The strong perceived effects across domains such as physical health, mental well-being, job satisfaction, and social connectedness indicate that wellness programs are not merely symbolic but are experienced as relevant and beneficial components of organizational life, consistent with prior findings in public-sector settings (Calapre et al., 2024; Orpiada & Tamayo, 2024).

A key finding of the study is the consistently high level of engagement, particularly in cognitive and affective dimensions, indicating that employees understand, value, and emotionally connect with wellness initiatives.

However, slightly lower behavioral engagement suggests that participation is influenced by practical constraints rather than lack of interest. This aligns with literature describing LGU employees as receptive to organizational programs but selectively involved due to competing demands (Balingcasag et al., 2025; Fabillar et al., 2025). The strong engagement observed supports the assumptions of Social Exchange Theory, where employees reciprocate perceived organizational support with positive attitudes and participation (Blau, 1964). Thus, engagement emerges not only as a behavioral outcome but as a relational process that strengthens employees' evaluation of wellness programs.

In contrast, the moderate level of physical activity reflects the structural realities of LGU work environments. The dominance of travel-related activity over work-based and recreational activity indicates that movement is largely incidental rather than structured. This finding is consistent with studies describing office-based and administrative roles as sedentary, with physical activity integrated into daily routines rather than formal exercise (Umematsu et al., 2020; Calapre et al., 2024). Post-pandemic conditions, including fatigue and disrupted routines, further contribute to moderate activity levels (Chaloupková et al., 2023; Castro, 2025). Importantly, the absence of a significant relationship between physical activity and perceived program effects suggests that individual health behaviors operate independently of how employees evaluate organizational wellness initiatives, supporting the perspective of Self-Determination Theory that behavior is driven by intrinsic motivation rather than external program structures (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

The moderate workload reported by participants highlights the demanding yet manageable nature of LGU employment. While workload is consistently present, variability in responses indicates that some employees experience heavier demands depending on their roles and responsibilities. This aligns with literature portraying LGU work as characterized by sustained administrative pressure, time constraints, and continuous service delivery (Lorenzo et al., 2021; Yap, 2023). Notably, workload demonstrated a significant positive relationship with perceived program effects, suggesting that employees with higher demands may perceive wellness programs as more valuable resources. This finding supports the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory, which posits that organizational resources, such as wellness programs, become more salient and beneficial in the presence of higher job demands (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Finally, the combined analysis underscores that engagement is the strongest predictor of perceived wellness program effects, followed by workload, while physical activity does not significantly contribute to the model. The regression results indicate that a substantial proportion of variance in perceived effects is explained by these variables, emphasizing the central role of organizational and contextual factors. These findings highlight that wellness program effectiveness in LGUs is primarily shaped by how employees engage with the program and how it is situated within their work environment, rather than by individual lifestyle behaviors alone. Overall, the study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that engagement-driven and context-sensitive approaches are critical in enhancing the perceived value and impact of wellness programs in public-sector organizations.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study. First, the study was conducted within a single LGU in Bukidnon, Philippines, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other LGUs, regions, or public-sector institutions whose organizational culture, staffing patterns, and wellness program structures may differ. The results are therefore best understood as context-specific rather than nationally representative. Second, the study employed a cross-sectional descriptive–correlational design, which captures relationships among variables at a single point in time but does not permit causal inferences. The observed associations among engagement, workload, and perceived program effects should not be interpreted as evidence that one variable produces changes in another.

Third, all variables were measured through self-report questionnaires, which introduces the possibility of common-method variance and social-desirability bias. Because engagement, workload, and perceived effects were obtained from the same respondents using similar response formats, the strength of some observed relationships may be partly attributable to shared method variance rather than to substantive associations alone. Fourth, two of the four instruments—the engagement scale and the perceived-effects scale—were researcher-developed. Although both underwent expert content validation and pilot testing and demonstrated high internal

consistency, they have not yet been validated across other populations, and their construct validity beyond the present sample remains to be established.

Fifth, physical activity was assessed using a five-point interpretive adaptation of the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire rather than its standard metabolic-equivalent (MET-minutes) scoring protocol. While this approach allowed comparability with the other Likert-based measures in the study, it departs from the GPAQ's conventional scoring and may have reduced the sensitivity of the physical activity measure, which should be considered when interpreting its non-significant association with perceived program effects. Finally, the study focused on perceived effects rather than objective health, productivity, or attendance outcomes; perceptions, while valuable, may not fully correspond to actual changes in well-being or performance.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationships among engagement in the wellness program, physical activity level, workload, and the perceived effects of the LGU wellness program among employees in a local government setting. The findings demonstrate that employees' positive evaluations of the wellness program are strongly associated with their level of engagement and meaningfully influenced by workload conditions, while general physical activity levels operate independently of program perception. These results highlight the importance of organizational and contextual factors in shaping how wellness initiatives are experienced in public-sector environments.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings support the integrated framework grounded in Social Exchange Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory. The strong association between engagement and perceived program effects aligns with Social Exchange Theory, suggesting that employees reciprocate perceived organizational support through positive program evaluations. The moderate relationship between workload and perceived effects reflects the JD-R perspective, where job demands shape how organizational resources are experienced. Meanwhile, the absence of a significant relationship between physical activity level and perceived effects underscores the Self-Determination Theory perspective that motivation and contextual support, rather than behavior alone, influence how wellness initiatives are perceived.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and the limitations identified, the following recommendations are advanced.

For local government management and human resource offices, the central role of engagement in shaping perceived program effects suggests that wellness initiatives should be designed to actively foster cognitive, affective, and behavioral involvement rather than simply making programs available. Efforts to strengthen communication, encourage voluntary participation, and build a sense of ownership over wellness activities are likely to enhance how employees evaluate and benefit from these programs. Given that behavioral engagement was slightly lower than the cognitive and affective dimensions, management may also consider reducing practical barriers to participation, such as scheduling conflicts and competing workload demands.

For program implementation, the significant positive association between workload and perceived program effects suggests that employees facing higher demands may particularly value wellness resources. Wellness programs should therefore be positioned not as additional obligations but as accessible organizational resources that can be integrated into the flow of work, including brief, flexible, and on-site activities that accommodate busy schedules. The limited and largely incidental nature of physical activity observed among employees further suggests that LGUs could incorporate structured, low-barrier movement opportunities into the workday.

For policy, the findings support the institutionalization of engagement-driven and workload-sensitive wellness strategies within public-sector human resource frameworks. Embedding wellness considerations into organizational planning, rather than treating them as standalone health activities, may improve both program uptake and perceived value across the workforce.

For future research, several directions are recommended. First, comparative and multi-site studies across several LGUs or regions would strengthen the generalizability of the findings. Second, longitudinal or mixed-methods designs would help clarify the directionality of the relationships observed here and capture how engagement and perceived effects evolve over time. Third, future studies should incorporate objective indicators, such as biometric health measures, attendance, or productivity records, alongside perceptual measures, and should consider using the standard MET-based GPAQ scoring to more precisely characterize physical activity. Finally, further validation of the researcher-developed engagement and perceived-effects instruments across diverse public-sector populations would enhance their utility for subsequent research.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest in the conduct, analysis, or reporting of this study.

REFERENCES

1. Armstrong, T., & Bull, F. (2006). Development of the World Health Organization Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ). *Journal of Public Health*, 14(2), 66–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-006-0024-x>
2. Balingcasag, J. M., Playto, J. C., Labial, L. C., Nnganlag, M. A., & Salait, J. R. (2025). Factors affecting workplace stress in examining the stress management practices of the employees in the local government unit of Malitbog, Bukidnon. *DIT.ADS International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 38. <https://doi.org/10.63941/dit.adsimrj.2025.03>
3. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.
4. Calapre, M. A., Sabile, L. P., Villamar, E. T., & Saranza, C. J. (2024). Investigating the dynamics of organizational commitment and trust among public employees in a Philippine local government unit (LGU). *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i06-01>
5. Castro, J. A. (2025). Spatial autocorrelation analysis of the fiscal impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on Philippine local government units: A study of Luzon Island. *Planning Malaysia*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.21837/pm.v23i35.1689>
6. Chaloupková, P., Petrtyl, M., Durand, C., Nikolaou, C., Mangione, G., & Kokoška, L. (2023). Assessment of the COVID-19 virus outbreak on dietary patterns, physical activity, and lifestyle behaviours: A survey among adult European citizens. *British Food Journal*, 125(10), 3698–3716. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2022-0781>
7. Chawla, S., Sareen, P., & Gupta, S. (2022). Wellness programs an employee engagement technique pre and during pandemic: A systematic literature review. *ECS Transactions*, 107(1), 3505–3521. <https://doi.org/10.1149/10701.3505ecst>
8. Concepcion, B. L., Cruz, L. M., Chávez, A. R., Briones, J. T., & Abante, M. J. (2024). Employees' work-life balance and career contentment in a Philippine local government unit. *Applied Quantitative Analysis*, 4(2), 146–159. <https://doi.org/10.31098/quant.2760>
9. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.
10. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
11. Duffy, C., Jennings, J., Shuck, B., & Immekus, J. (2024). Employee engagement with corporate-based health and wellness programs: A multiple regression analysis. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 36(2), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19394225241242893>

12. Fabillar, J. A., Reposo, M. E., & Sultan, A. M. (2025). Evaluating the physical mobility levels and well-being of elders: Insights from the countryside setting of the Philippines. *Journal of Educational Health and Community Psychology*, 251–265. <https://doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.vi.29897>
13. Lorenzo, E. M., Paguio, D. R., & Asio, J. M. R. (2021). Budget allocation system of a highly urbanized local government unit in Central Luzon, Philippines. *International Journal of Humanities Management and Social Science*, 4(2), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.36079/lamintang.ij-humass-0402.283>
14. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html>
15. Orpiada, M. A., & Tamayo, M. D. (2024). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of local government employees in one Philippine province. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies and Development*, 12(3), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.70979/rqfz5287>
16. Reif, J., Chan, D., Jones, D., Payne, L., & Molitor, D. (2020). Effects of a workplace wellness program on employee health, health beliefs, and medical use: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 180(7), 952–960. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1321>
17. Santoso, J. (2024). Employee well-being programs: Assessing the impact on engagement, productivity, and retention. *PRODUCTIVITY*, 1(3), 472–484. <https://doi.org/10.62207/fhxmdw77>
18. Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory, and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.3.4.356>
19. Umematsu, T., Sano, A., Taylor, S., Tsujikawa, M., & Picard, R. W. (2020). Forecasting stress, mood, and health from daytime physiology in office workers and students. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Conference* (pp. 5953–5957). <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC44109.2020.9176706>
20. Yap, K. A. (2023). Level of stress among employees in the local government unit of Batac: Basis for intervention programs. In *Proceedings* (pp. 107–117). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-160-9_12