

The Impact of Workplace Environment on Employee Productivity and Employee Health in the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita, Pampanga

Aaron Paul O. Valencia

Holy Angel University, Angeles City, Philippines

Author Email: aaronpaulvalencia27@gmail.com

Date received: October 7, 2025

Date revised: November 11, 2025

Date accepted: November 21, 2025

Originality: 99%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 1%

Recommended citation:

Valencia, A.P. (2025). The impact of workplace environment on employee productivity and employee health in the local government unit of Santa Rita, Pampanga. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(12), 219-229. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.701>

Abstract. This study examined the impact of physical and psychosocial workplace environments on employee productivity and health in Santa Rita, Pampanga. Using a descriptive and correlational research design, the study found that most male respondents were aged 31-40, while most female respondents were aged 21-30; both groups had similar educational and employment characteristics. The study's results showed that the physical workplace environment was positively rated ($\bar{x} = 3.38$), with flexible furniture arrangements noted as a key strength. Similarly, the psychosocial workplace environment was reported as conducive to employee needs ($\bar{x} = 3.25$), particularly regarding good working conditions. Employee productivity levels were high ($\bar{x} = 3.40$), and respondents reported consistently meeting their work targets. Employee health was also positively rated ($\bar{x} = 2.56$), though back pain was a common concern. Moreover, a significant relationship ($r = 0.209$, $p = 0.014$) was found between the physical workplace environment and employee productivity. However, no significant relationship was found between physical workplace environment and employee health ($r = 0.029$, $p = 0.736$). Additionally, no significant relationship was found between the psychosocial workplace environment and employee productivity ($r = 0.015$, $p = 0.858$); similarly, no significant relationship was found between the psychosocial workplace environment and employee health ($r = 0.165$, $p = 0.058$). Lastly, no significant relationship was found between employee health and employee productivity ($r = 0.129$, $p = 0.132$). This study highlights the significance of a positive work environment in promoting employee productivity. While other factors may directly impact health, the findings offer valuable insights into workplace conditions in local government units. These results support future initiatives to enhance employee well-being and productivity.

Keywords: Employee health; Employee productivity; Physical workplace environment; Psychosocial workplace environment.

1.0 Introduction

The workplace environment refers to the surroundings or atmosphere in which employees work (Rodriguez, 2021). According to Herrity (2023), it encompasses the physical conditions and social features that influence workplace relationships, collaboration, efficiency, and employee health. The workplace environment comprises two key elements: the physical workplace environment and the psychosocial workplace environment. The physical workplace environment encompasses the layout and amenities of an in-person office, including desk space, location, and lighting (Perry, 2023). The psychosocial workplace environment refers to the organization of work and the social dynamics among employees. Social support, positive relationships, leadership, clear roles, organizational stability, effective communication, and psychological security are key characteristics of it. Moreover, Employee productivity is the value an employee generates over a specific period (Basu & Mallick, 2020). To improve productivity, organizations should focus on better

onboarding, avoiding micromanagement, promoting flexible work arrangements, encouraging collaboration and open communication, providing ongoing training, seeking feedback, and fostering a culture of transparency (Engage, 2024). Furthermore, Employee health refers to employees' overall well-being in the workplace (Wellable, 2023). Interestingly, Kelly et al. (2021) found that employee health may be achieved when employees are given control over how they do their work, having an increase in the stability in their schedule, being provided with opportunities to identify and solve problems, having the organization adequately staffed, encouraging managers to support their personal needs and taking steps to foster a sense of belonging.

The workplace environment is a critical factor in promoting employee productivity, satisfaction, and overall well-being. A positive physical environment, characterized by good lighting, ergonomic furniture, and clean surroundings, can reduce physical strain and maximize employee focus. Likewise, a supportive psychosocial environment that fosters respect, inclusivity, and open communication can boost morale and minimize stress. Employees are a valuable asset of every organization. Their importance in the workplace should be valued, as they contribute to several aspects of an organization's culture, operations, and overall performance. Understanding workplace dynamics has become increasingly important as they have a profound and lasting impact on employee productivity and well-being (Rastrullo, 2023). Over the years, technological advancements and shifts in work styles have transformed traditional office settings (Donovan, 2023). The modern workplace often features more innovative technologies, ergonomic designs, and flexible work arrangements (Sombret, 2024). In today's competitive business landscape, organizations strive to maintain a competitive edge (Athuraliya, 2023). Mason (2024) argued that the workplace environment itself can be a key competitive advantage, as employees now expect innovative, advanced, and flexible work settings.

A study conducted by Pimpong (2023) found a strong relationship between the physical workplace environment and employee productivity. The physical work environment affects how employees perform tasks, interact with one another, and are directed. A suitable, accommodating, and conducive workplace environment enhances employees' physical and mental abilities in carrying out their jobs and tasks. The building design, workspace layout, cleanliness, ventilation, equipment design, space, temperature, vibration, lighting, systems, noise, radiation, and air quality are all determinants of the physical working environment, which affects employee concentration and, consequently, productivity. Shaari et al. (2022) found that placing greater emphasis on the physical workplace environment increases employee productivity by providing a comfortable, suitable, and conducive work environment. Moreover, a research study by Hafeez et al. (2019) examined the impact of physical workplace environment factors, including cleanliness, lighting, noise, and seating, on employee health. The findings revealed that these environmental factors significantly affected employee health. The study concluded that a significant positive relationship exists between the physical working environment and employee health. Similarly, a review of studies by Babapour et al. (2020) found that physical work environment factors, such as office layout and technical aspects, including equipment and furniture, affect employee health, particularly in ergonomics and design. Conversely, Colenberg et al. (2020) found that open-plan offices, shared rooms, and high background noise were negatively related to employee health.

Interestingly, Maqsoom et al. (2019) investigated the impact of extrinsic psychosocial stressors on employee productivity in the workplace, with the work environment being a key measure. This research revealed that, due to congestion and limited access to various tools, indicators used to measure the psychosocial work environment were found to influence worker productivity. Shaari et al. (2022) revealed that psychosocial workplace characteristics, such as enhanced co-worker support, supervisor support in completing work, and consideration of working hours, can affect employee productivity. Additionally, the study by Saidu et al. (2021) demonstrated that an environment characterized by open communication and a supportive team spirit can increase employee productivity. Furthermore, the psychosocial workplace environment is considered a building block of employees' psychological experiences and can have lasting implications for their health and well-being (Urbanaviciute et al., 2021). Factors like job demands and resources, such as heavy workloads or a lack of autonomy, can negatively affect employee health, leading to physical pain and stress. Conversely, providing employees with opportunities for skill development can improve their morale. Likewise, Flovik et al. (2019) found that unfavorable psychosocial conditions can contribute to adverse health effects, which are often observed following organizational changes. These findings suggest that the psychosocial workplace environment directly affects employee health.

Lastly, a positive relationship exists between employee health and productivity. A study by Chang (2024) found that when employees are healthy and mentally sound, they tend to be more focused, motivated, and satisfied, leading to fewer sick days and enhanced productivity. A review of studies by Mora et al. (2020) supported this finding, indicating that occupational health, which focuses on protecting and promoting employees' physical and mental well-being, has a positive impact on their productivity.

While a large body of evidence links the physical work environment to employee productivity and health globally, the impact of the psychosocial work environment on these factors is relatively understudied, especially in local settings. Therefore, this study aims to examine further the effects of both physical and psychosocial work environments on employee productivity and overall health. By examining the impact of factors such as workspace design, ergonomics, management practices, social support, and organizational culture on employees' performance and well-being, the study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the workplace as a key determinant of employee outcomes. Moreover, it contributes to the limited body of research on the psychosocial aspects of the workplace, offering insights that can guide organizations, policymakers, and researchers in developing healthier, more productive work environments.

The study aims to assess the impact of the workplace environment on the productivity and health of Municipal Employees in Santa Rita, Pampanga. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions: (1) How may the state of workplace environment in the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita, Pampanga be described in terms of: (1.1) Physical Workplace Environment; and (1.2) Psychosocial Workplace Environment. (2) How may the level of employee productivity be described? (3) How may the level of employee health be described? (4) Is there a significant impact of the physical workplace environment on employee productivity and employee health? (5) Is there a significant impact of the psychosocial workplace environment on employee productivity and employee health? (6) Is there a significant impact of employee health on employee productivity? Furthermore, the hypotheses will be tested to determine the statistical significance of the relationship among the variables.

The following hypotheses will be tested at the 0.05 significance level to determine the statistical significance of the relationships among the variables:

H01: The physical workplace environment impacts employee productivity.

H02: The physical workplace environment impacts employee health.

H03: The psychosocial workplace environment impacts employee productivity.

H04: The psychosocial workplace environment impacts employee health.

H05: Employee health impacts employee productivity.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design. A descriptive research design was used to accurately and systematically identify characteristics, frequencies, categories, situations, or phenomena (McCombes, 2019). This design helped describe the demographic characteristics of employees at the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita and to observe how the workplace environment impacted their productivity and health. A correlational research design was employed to investigate the relationship between two variables (Eckel, 2023). Cherry (2020b) explained that a correlation can have three possible results: a positive correlation, a negative correlation, or no correlation. In this study, a positive correlation between the variables indicated that the workplace environment could influence employees' productivity and health. The research design applied helped generalize the findings and test the reliability of the workplace environment on employees' demographic characteristics, productivity, and health. The findings generated from this design were used to recommend a conducive workplace environment that can increase productivity and improve employee health.

2.2 Participants and Sampling Technique

In this study, purposive sampling was used to select respondents who were current employees of the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita. Participants were selected from over 300 employees working in the Local Government Unit of Santa, with different employment statuses, permanent, co-terminus, casual, and job order. The study included 138 respondents.

2.3 Research Instrument

The primary research instrument for this study was a questionnaire with two parts: demographic characteristics and the study's variables (workplace environment, employee productivity, and employee health). The demographic characteristics included age, sex, level of education, employment status, and work experience. The second part consisted of a 46-item questionnaire, including 12 items on the physical workplace environment, 19 on the psychosocial workplace environment, 8 on employee health, and 7 on employee productivity. The physical workplace environment and employee health questionnaires were adopted from Hafeez et al. (2019). The Psychosocial Work Environment Questionnaire was adopted from Fernandes et al. (2020), and the Employee Productivity Questionnaire was adopted from Pimpong (2023). All items in the second part were measured using a four-point Likert scale. This scale was used to collect data on variables evaluated using the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient, which allowed respondents to indicate their degree of agreement with the options: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (agree), and 4 (strongly agree). The Likert scale provided a straightforward method for evaluation, allowing us to quantify the intensity of the respondents' answers (Deckelmann, 2019).

The results of the conducted reliability analysis for the present study revealed a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.813 for assessing the physical workplace environment. Additionally, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.867 was found to assess the psychosocial aspects of the workplace environment. Further, the reliability analysis showed a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.891 for assessing employee health. Moreover, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.880 was found to assess employee productivity. This suggests that the questionnaire has good internal consistency, indicating a reliable instrument.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The questionnaire developed for this study gathered information on how the workplace environment at the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Santa Rita impacts the productivity and health of its employees. The research employed the following procedures to collect the data. First, the researcher sought approval from the Local Chief Executive/Municipal Mayor of the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita. A request letter was sent to the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita, outlining the purpose of the study and including a copy of the research instrument. Second, this research employed face-to-face data collection, with printed copies of the questionnaire distributed to respondents. The Local Government Unit of Santa Rita closely monitored the communication between the researcher and its employees in accordance with the company's Data Privacy policy.

The researcher prepared and printed the research questionnaire, informed consent forms, and the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita's logo. An informed consent form was provided to each participant to ensure the confidentiality of their responses and their anonymity. The survey was completed only by respondents who voluntarily signified their intention to answer the instrument. Approximately 10 to 15 minutes were allotted for completing the questionnaire. After retrieving 138 valid responses, all were encoded into an MS Excel file for data analysis. Confidentiality was an important consideration for both the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita and the researcher. We used employees' information solely for academic purposes and did not use it for any other purpose. After successfully collecting the data, the researcher used a statistical tool to test the hypothesis and obtain results. Lastly, the researcher prepared a tabulation and interpretation of the results.

2.5 Data Analysis Procedure

The data used in the study were processed using the JAMOV software in six steps. First, descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were used to present the overall profile of the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita's employees, including age, employment status, length of work experience, gender, and level of education. Second, computing the average weighted mean, which was used to describe the workplace environment in terms of physical and psychosocial dimensions, and the level of employee productivity and employee health. The third step was to run a normality test using the Shapiro-Wilk Test. If the Sig. The Shapiro-Wilk test value was greater than 0.05; the data are normal and parametric. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used. If the Shapiro-Wilk test significance value were less than 0.05, indicating that the data significantly deviated from normality and were nonparametric, we would have had to use the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation. This correlation coefficient was used to determine whether the physical and psychosocial workplace environments had a significant impact on employee productivity and health, and to assess the impact of employee health on productivity.

The researcher analyzed the 138 data points by examining the demographic information from the first part of the questionnaire using descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage). To calculate the rate, the researcher divided the frequency for each group by the total number of respondents and multiplied it by 100% (Davis, 2021a). The interpreted data were presented in tables in the results chapter of this study. The 46-item questionnaire was assessed using a four-point Likert scale, which allowed the researcher to assess the importance of the variables and the respondents' level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. The interpretation of the Likert-scale range was adopted from Nee et al. (2020). This four-point scale lacked a neutral option, forcing respondents to provide a thoughtful opinion on every question (Fleetwood, 2023; Lianablatnik, 2023). This method helped identify the extent of employees' agreement or disagreement with their workplace environment and its impact on their productivity and health. For the second part of the questionnaire, the researcher explored whether the physical and psychosocial work environments have a positive impact on employee productivity and health. The researcher assessed the data gathered using the Spearman Rank-Order correlation. The researcher analyzed the statistical relationships of the variables using correlational research. It also allowed the researcher to accurately assess the strength of each dimension of the workplace environment on employee productivity and employee health, as well as the hypothetical relationships between the variables.

2.6 Ethical Consideration

This study obtained ethical approval from the Holy Angel University Institutional Review Board (HAU-IRB) to ensure compliance with research ethics standards. Before the survey, the participants were informed about the study's objectives and the significance of their contributions. The researcher also obtained their permission to conduct the study, and participation was voluntary. Participants were given an Informed Consent Form to sign before starting, and the entire survey took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. The researcher did not offer any monetary or non-monetary benefits for participation, ensuring that all responses were given voluntarily. The researcher respected the participants' right to privacy and was committed to protecting their information's confidentiality. No sensitive personal information such as email addresses, home addresses, or mobile phone numbers was collected or stored. Consent was obtained at the beginning of the survey, and the researcher did not proceed with data collection until full consent was provided. The respondents' responses remained anonymous. The respondents of this study were not subject to any form of abuse or harm throughout and after the study. The researcher attempted to minimize the risk of discomfort. The respondents were informed that there would be minimal risks associated with participating in the study, as participants may feel uncomfortable answering personal and/or sensitive questions. All the data collected by the researcher was treated with utmost confidentiality and used only for the study. The respondents were also assured of the confidentiality of their answers.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 revealed that most respondents were female (52%, $n = 72$), while the fewest were male (48%, $n = 66$). Most of the female respondents were between 21 and 30 years old (32%, $n = 23$), whereas the fewest were 61 years old and above (8%, $n = 6$). In contrast, most male respondents were in the 31-40 age group (32%, $n = 21$), with the fewest being in the 51-60 age group (9%, $n = 6$). Regarding educational attainment, a majority of both female (54%, $n = 39$) and male (55%, $n = 36$) respondents had earned a bachelor's degree. The fewest respondents in both groups had a doctorate (3%, $n = 2$). Regarding employment status, most female participants were in permanent positions (54%, $n = 39$), with the fewest in casual positions (13%, $n = 9$). Similarly, most male participants were permanent (44%, $n = 29$), while the fewest were casual (12%, $n = 8$). As for work experience, most female respondents had been with their company for 5 years or more (36%, $n = 26$), while the fewest had been employed for 3 to 4 years (10%, $n = 7$). Similarly, most male respondents had five or more years of experience (35%, $n = 23$), while the fewest had less than one year of experience (15%, $n = 10$) or three to four years (15%, $n = 10$).

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Demographic Profile

Demographic Profile:	Male		Female		Total
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	
Sex:	66	48%	72	52%	138
Age:					
Under 20	0	0%	0	0%	0
21-30	15	23%	23	32%	38
31-40	21	32%	21	30%	42
41-50	16	24%	14	19%	30
51-60	6	9%	8	11%	14

61 above	8	12%	6	8%	14
	66	100%	72	100%	138
Level of Education:					
Vocational	24	36%	23	32%	47
Bachelor	36	55%	39	54%	75
Masters	4	6%	8	11%	12
PHD	2	3%	2	3%	4
	66	100%	72	100%	138
Status of Employment:					
Permanent	29	44%	39	54%	68
Casual	8	12%	9	13%	17
Co-terminus	11	17%	11	15%	22
Job Order	18	27%	13	18%	31
	66	100%	72	100%	138
Length of Work Experience:					
< 1 Year	10	15%	9	13%	19
1-2 Years	11	17%	8	11%	19
2-3 Years	12	18%	22	30%	34
3-4 Years	10	15%	7	10%	17
5 Years or more	23	35%	26	36%	49
	66	100%	72	100%	138

3.2 Respondents' Physical Workplace Environment

When the respondents' perceptions of their physical workplace environment were assessed, the results indicated that they strongly agreed that their workplace furniture was flexible, allowing for adjustment, rearrangement, or reorganization ($\bar{x} = 3.88$, $SD = 0.343$). They also agreed that their workplace was not dusty and was cleaned properly ($\bar{x} = 3.49$, $SD = 0.730$). Overall, the respondents showed a similar level of agreement regarding their physical workplace environment ($\bar{x} = 3.69$, $SD = 0.282$), indicating that they considered it satisfactory. The finding that most respondents strongly agreed that their furniture was flexible suggests they were delighted with its flexibility in their working areas. According to Sproston (2022), understanding employees' need for space should be a top priority for companies, as adaptable space is key to a people-first approach, and flexible furniture is one way to achieve this objective.

Furthermore, the respondents' agreement on the cleanliness of their workplace implies satisfaction in this area. The cleanliness of a workspace is said to impact employee productivity, as a clean and organized environment can positively affect focus, efficiency, creativity, and reduce stress and anxiety (Brennan & Co. Cleaning Professionals, 2022). Overall, the respondents' consistent agreement across all indicators suggests they were satisfied with the physical aspects of their workplace. This finding is supported by a study from Kegel (2019), which concluded that the physical work environment, including space layout, architectural elements, aesthetics, and furniture, can impact worker effectiveness.

Table 2. Respondents' State of Workplace Environment in Terms of Physical Workplace Environment

Constructs	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. My furniture is flexible to adjust, rearrange, or reorganize my workspace.	3.88	0.343	Strongly Agree
2. My furniture is comfortable enough so that I can work without getting tired during extended hours.	3.86	0.366	Strongly Agree
3. I have adequate and comfortable space in my office.	3.74	0.596	Strongly Agree
4. My workplace is dusty and not appropriately cleared.	3.49	0.730	Agree
5. The sweeper also cleans the office during office hours without disturbing any employee.	3.22	0.592	Agree
6. My workspace is provided with efficient lighting.	3.18	0.607	Agree
7. Do you control the lighting on your desk (i.e, adjustable desk light on desk)?	3.39	0.585	Agree
8. An ample amount of Natural light comes into my office.	3.51	0.557	Strongly Agree
9. The number of windows in my work area meets my fresh air and light needs.	3.51	0.544	Strongly Agree
10. My work area is sufficiently equipped for my typical needs (standard, storage, movements, etc.).	3.51	0.557	Strongly Agree
11. I am satisfied with the amount of space for storage and displaying essential materials.	3.47	0.556	Agree
12. My workplace serves multi-purpose functions for informal and instant meetings.	3.51	0.544	Strongly Agree
Physical Workplace Environment	3.38	0.282	Agree

3.3 Respondents' Psychosocial Workplace Environment

When the psychosocial workplace environment was assessed, most respondents strongly agreed that their workplace had good working conditions ($x = 3.78$, $SD = 0.448$). Meanwhile, several respondents disagreed that their work sometimes overlapped with their social and family lives ($x = 1.57$, $SD = 0.855$). In general, participants show a similar level of agreement regarding the psychosocial workplace environment ($x = 3.25$, $SD = 0.237$), indicating that respondents generally agree that the psychosocial workplace environment in their workplace is at a reasonable level. The analysis revealed that most respondents strongly agree that they have good working conditions at their workplace. This implied that the respondents, as LGU employees, are very satisfied with their working conditions. This aligns with the study by Bashir et al. (2019), which highlighted that work conditions positively contribute to employee efficiency. At the same time, several respondents disagree that their work sometimes overlaps with their social and family lives. This implied that the respondents are also satisfied with the work-life balance their jobs offer. This is consistent with the research by Roopavathi & Kulothungan (2021), which concluded that work-life balance is of considerable importance in modern workplaces, as evidenced by respondents' positive responses when there is a work-life balance. In general, the respondents express the same level of agreement regarding their psychosocial workplace environment. This implied that the respondents were satisfied with the psychosocial aspects of their work. This is supported by a study led by Kamalulil & Panatik (2024), which found that psychosocial work environments significantly influence employees' well-being across settings. The psychosocial workplace environment, including job demands and job control, also has a significant impact.

Table 3. *Respondents' State of Workplace Environment in Terms of Psychosocial Workplace Environment*

Constructs	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. There are good working conditions.	3.78	0.448	Strongly Agree
2. There are resources needed to perform the work.	3.74	0.473	Strongly Agree
3. Work requires learning and ongoing updates.	3.55	0.695	Strongly Agree
4. There is a clear definition of objectives.	1.78	0.842	Disagree
5. There is involvement in decision-making and goal setting.	3.20	0.614	Agree
6. The service is distributed evenly.	3.22	0.509	Agree
7. The leader gives clear guidelines and sets priorities for the team.	3.30	0.599	Agree
8. The leader knows when to support and advise or give autonomy.	3.41	0.647	Agree
9. The leader recognizes your work.	3.45	0.593	Agree
10. Employees are not professionally stagnant.	3.41	0.600	Agree
11. Prospects for career progression are good.	3.36	0.626	Agree
12. The training and knowledge gained are valued for career progression.	3.36	0.637	Agree
13. There is a good relationship with your colleagues.	3.34	0.645	Agree
14. There is good communication and sharing of information between colleagues.	3.33	0.641	Agree
15. The help and support of colleagues are frequent.	3.46	0.556	Agree
16. The situation of verbal violence is not recurrent.	3.47	0.556	Agree
17. There is flexibility and understanding for family life.	3.53	0.582	Strongly Agree
18. Work sometimes overlaps with social and family life.	1.57	0.855	Disagree
19. The time you have is enough to accomplish your tasks.	3.48	0.803	Agree
Psychosocial Workplace Environment	3.25	0.237	Agree

3.4 Respondents' Employee Productivity

When respondents' employee productivity was assessed, the results showed that they strongly agreed they always finish work within the target number of cooperatives ($x = 3.70$, $SD = 0.532$). Some of them also agree that they are ready to put in extra effort to complete my schedules because of the enabling environment ($x = 3.36$, $SD = 0.639$). In conclusion, the respondents show the same level of agreement regarding their productivity as employees ($x = 3.47$, $SD = 0.429$), suggesting that their productivity is at a High level. Overall, most respondents strongly agree that they always complete their work according to the target number of cooperatives. This implies they have very high levels of employee productivity in achieving their work objectives. This aligns with Stryker (2024), who highlighted that a worker's efficiency and effectiveness in achieving an organization's goals are indicators of productivity. The respondents' agreement that their workplace environment did not restrict their performance implied that it positively contributed to their productivity, consistent with Pimpong (2023), who underscored the significant influence of the work environment on employee productivity. The overall findings suggest that LGU employees in Santa Rita, Pampanga, have a high level of productivity, which is supported by Tipanero's (2024) research on LGU workers in the Partido District.

Table 4. Level of Employee Productivity Among Respondents

Constructs	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I always finish work according to the target number of cooperatives.	3.70	0.532	Strongly Agree
2. I always finish work according to expected standards.	3.62	0.558	Strongly Agree
3. I am always on time in starting work.	3.46	0.594	Agree
4. My workplace environment helps me to finish my duties and roles on time.	3.37	0.605	Agree
5. I am not restricted in my performance by my workplace environment.	3.35	0.624	Agree
6. I am ready to put in extra efforts to get my schedules completed because of the enabling environment.	3.36	0.639	Agree
7. My workplace environment motivates me to work better.	3.40	0.657	Agree
Employee Productivity	3.47	0.429	Agree

3.5 Respondents' Employee Health

Regarding employee health, the findings showed that most participants reported experiencing back pain ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31, SD = 3.636), while some disagreed that they had carpal tunnel syndrome ($\bar{x}$ = 1.58, SD = 0.878). In general, the respondents showed a similar level of agreement regarding their employee health ($\bar{x}$ = 2.56, SD = 0.870), suggesting their health was high. The finding that most respondents experienced back pain is supported by the International Association for the Study of Pain (2022), which revealed that back pain is a common issue among working adults. Meanwhile, the low level of carpal tunnel syndrome among respondents could be attributed to factors other than work, such as genetic predisposition or other medical conditions (Sevy et al., 2023). In summary, the low level of health issues suggests the employees of the LGU in Santa Rita, Pampanga, are satisfied with their health at work. This finding is consistent with Chang's (2024) research, which found that healthy, mentally sound employees exhibit increased motivation and job satisfaction, resulting in enhanced performance.

Table 5. Level of Employee Health Among Respondents

Constructs	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. My job tends to affect my health directly.	2.88	0.936	Agree
2. Have you experienced any sickness during your employment?	2.88	0.947	Agree
3. I suffered from a headache.	3.06	0.966	Agree
4. I got back pain.	3.31	3.636	Agree
5. I had nerve problems.	2.03	0.942	Disagree
6. I have eye side problems.	1.93	0.961	Disagree
7. I had high blood pressure.	2.87	0.957	Agree
8. I got carpal tunnel syndrome.	1.58	0.878	Disagree
Employee Health	2.56	0.870	Agree

3.6 Correlation Result on the Impact of Workplace Environment on Employee Productivity and Employee Health

When the impact of the physical and psychosocial workplace environment on employee productivity and health was investigated, the Spearman's rho test revealed a significant, weak correlation between the physical workplace environment and employee productivity (r = 0.209, p = .014). This finding is supported by studies from Atmaja and Puspitawati (2018, as cited in Amante, 2024), Shaari et al. (2022), and Saidu et al. (2021), who found a strong relationship between the physical workplace environment and employee productivity. Additionally, Hamed et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of a well-designed, comfortable workstation in enhancing productivity and morale, as it can significantly affect an employee's ability to perform at their full potential. Also, no significant relationship was found, with a very weak correlation between the physical workplace environment and employee health (r = 0.029, p = .736), leading to the rejection of the hypothesis. This finding contrasts with the collective results of Hafeez et al. (2019), Babapour et al. (2020), and Colenberg et al. (2020), which revealed that the physical work environment has a significant impact on employee health.

Furthermore, there was no significant relationship and only a very weak correlation between the psychosocial workplace environment and employee productivity (r = 0.015, p = 0.858), which led to the rejection of the hypothesis. This finding contrasts with the results of studies by Maqsoom et al. (2019), Shaari et al. (2022), and Saidu et al. (2021), which found that the psychosocial workplace environment influences worker productivity. Moreover, there was no significant relationship, with a weak correlation, between the psychosocial workplace environment and employee health (r = 0.165, p = .058), which led to the rejection of the hypothesis. This finding contrasts with the results of studies by Urbanaviciute et al. (2021) and Flovik et al. (2019), which revealed a significant relationship between the psychosocial workplace environment and employee health.

There was no significant relationship and only a weak correlation between employee health and productivity ($r = 0.129$, $p = 0.132$), leading to the rejection of the hypothesis. This finding contrasts with the results of studies by Chang (2024) and Mora et al. (2020), which found that employee health significantly influences worker productivity. On the other hand, several other factors also impact employee productivity. According to Bi Worldwide (2025), employees can maintain their productivity through intrinsic motivation and a commitment to their job roles. Employees who are determined and goal-oriented tend to perform well, regardless of physical discomfort or mental stress. This drive enables them to meet deadlines, deliver high-quality outputs, and maintain optimal performance.

Given that most correlation results are insignificant, except for the impact of the physical workplace environment on employee productivity, other factors may have a greater influence on employee health and productivity, as suggested by Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. Factors such as compensation, benefits, job security, and company policies may have a greater impact on employee satisfaction. According to Humanica (2024), compensation and benefits are crucial to employee effectiveness and overall well-being. Organizations that pay fairly, offer competitive bonuses, and provide comprehensive benefits tend to have happier, more productive, and healthier employees. Additionally, Nahyan et al. (2024) found that job security significantly impacts employee productivity and health. When employees feel secure in their positions, they are more likely to perform effectively and maintain better physical and mental health. Lastly, employee-focused company policies, which underpin workplace culture and operations, can enhance employee productivity and well-being. In contrast, unclear policies can lead to confusion and stress, ultimately hurting productivity and overall well-being.

Table 6. *Impact of Physical and Psychosocial Workplace Environment on Employee Productivity and Employee Health*

Hypothesis	r-value	p-value	Interpretation	Decision
H1: Physical Workplace Environment → Employee Productivity	0.209	0.014	Weak Correlation, Significant	Accept the Hypothesis
H2: Physical Workplace Environment → Employee Health	0.029	0.736	Very Weak Correlation, Not Significant	Reject the Hypothesis
H3: Psychosocial Workplace Environment → Employee Productivity	0.015	0.858	Very Weak Correlation, Not Significant	Reject the Hypothesis
H4: Psychosocial Workplace Environment → Employee Health	0.165	0.058	Weak Correlation, Not Significant	Reject the Hypothesis
H5: Employee Health → Employee Productivity	0.129	0.132	Weak Correlation, Not Significant	Reject the Hypothesis

4.0 Conclusion

This research contributes significantly to the academe, employees, and workplace environments. It is one of the first in the Philippines to explore the impact of workplace environment on employee productivity and health, particularly from a psychosocial standpoint. The study focused on Santa Rita's physical and psychosocial environments and their impact on employee productivity and health. The findings can help Santa Rita and other organizations create optimal workplace environments by providing insights that contribute to employee productivity and well-being. Applying these findings can lead to improved employee retention, stronger teamwork, and overall organizational success. The study's findings described the demographic characteristics of the existing employees at the Local Government Unit of Santa Rita. Most were female, aged 21–30 years, holding a bachelor's degree, in permanent employment, with 5 or more years of experience. Furthermore, most of the male respondents were between 31 and 40 years old, with the same characteristics as the females.

The study also examined the state of the respondents' physical and psychosocial workplace environments, as well as their levels of productivity and health. The findings showed that the physical workplace environment was in good condition, with respondents strongly agreeing that their furniture was flexible enough to be adjusted, rearranged, and reorganized as needed. The psychosocial workplace environment was also in a good state, with a strong emphasis on good working conditions. Employee productivity was high, with respondents strongly agreeing that they consistently met their work targets. Employee health was also high, although back pain was identified as prevalent among the respondents. These findings underscore the importance of understanding how an organization's physical and psychosocial workplace environment influences employee productivity and well-being. A weak but significant relationship existed between the physical workplace environment and employee productivity. However, the result showed no significant relationship between the physical workplace environment and employee health, nor between the

psychosocial workplace environment and employee productivity. Moreover, there was no significant relationship between the psychosocial workplace environment and employee health, nor between employee health and employee productivity.

To further enrich the results, researchers recommend methodological improvements to yield more generalizable findings and to gather in-depth information that is often limited by standalone quantitative studies. Additionally, researchers can explore moderating variables such as age, job type, industry, and organizational culture to identify which employees or contexts are most affected. They may also consider gathering information on workplace resources and current programs, as this may be essential for assessing the physical and psychosocial conditions of the workplace environment for employees. Companies should not dismiss the importance of the workplace environment simply because this study showed weak statistical correlations. Companies should maintain a safe, clean, ergonomic, and comfortable physical workplace, as these factors remain fundamental for compliance and employee satisfaction. A positive psychosocial workplace environment is equally important and can be fostered through clear and open communication, supportive management, and opportunities for collaboration and teamwork.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The study was authored by Aaron Paul O. Valencia, who contributed to the conceptualization and final version of the paper.

6.0 Funding

No funding agency or institution funds the research.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The author declared that there is no conflict of interest regarding this study.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The author extends a special thanks to his family and thesis adviser, who were instrumental in the successful completion of this research.

9.0 References

- Atthuriya, A. (2023, January 5). How to successfully achieve and sustain competitive advantage. Creately Blog. <https://tinyurl.com/ypsy98z5>
- Atmaja, N. P., & Puspitawati, N. M. (2018). Effect of physical work environment through productivity and employees' job satisfaction as an intervening variable. <https://tinyurl.com/3dkdmpcr>
- Babapour, M., & Berlin, C. (2020). Physical work environment for health, well-being, and performance - A systematic review. ResearchGate. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20313.75366>
- Bashir, A., Amir, A., Jawaad, M., & Hasan, T. (2020). Work conditions and job performance: An indirect conditional effect of motivation. Cogent Business & Management, 7(1), 1801961. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1801961>
- BasuMallick, C. (2020, June 26). What is employee productivity? Definition, calculation, and best practices for improvement. Spiceworks Inc. <https://tinyurl.com/yc5tzspt>
- BI WORLDWIDE. (2025, March 28). Understanding the impact of intrinsic motivation - United Kingdom. United Kingdom. <https://tinyurl.com/2h4apsc9>
- Brennan & Co. Cleaning Professionals. (2024, April 16). The importance of a clean workspace for employee productivity. Brennan Clean. <https://tinyurl.com/46xh4h6p>
- Chang, R. (2024). The impact of employees' health and well-being on job performance. Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, 29(1), 372-378. <https://doi.org/10.54097/9ft7db35>
- Cherry, K. (2020b, July 13). How correlational studies are used in psychology. Verywell Mind. <https://tinyurl.com/3nd6j2a5>
- Colenberg, S., Jylhä, T., & Arkesteijn, M. (2020). The relationship between interior office space and employee health and well-being - A literature review. Building Research and Information/Building Research & Information, 49(3), 352-366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2019.1710098>
- Davis, B. (2021a, April 30). How do you find the percentage of respondents? Mvorganizing. <https://tinyurl.com/57p5ekzd>
- Tipanero, M. (2024). Factors influencing LGU efficiency and employee productivity during COVID-19 work-from-home arrangements: A mediation analysis. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, VIII(XI), 3185-3206. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.8110248>
- Deckelmann, D. (2019, June 11). What are the benefits of the Likert Scale? LiveSurvey. <https://tinyurl.com/yam4efen>
- Donovan, A. (2023, September 5). The evolution of the workplace environment - Studio Q architecture. Studio Q Architecture. <https://tinyurl.com/2kd5ezm7>
- Eckel, J. (2023, November 28). Correlational research: Design, methods, and examples. StudyCrumb. <https://tinyurl.com/jakyufyr>
- Engage, O. (2024, February 13). How to improve employee productivity in 10 easy steps. <https://tinyurl.com/7jpt8px>
- Fernandes, A., Figueiredo, M., Ribeiro, J., Neves, J., & Vicente, H. (2020). Psychosocial risks assessment in cryopreservation laboratories. Safety and Health at Work, 11(4), 431-442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2020.07.003>
- Fleetwood, D. (2023, October 17). What is a Likert Scale - Definition, example, characteristics, & advantages. QuestionPro. <https://tinyurl.com/mry2kt82>
- Fløvik, L., Knardahl, S., & Christensen, J. O. (2024). The effect of organizational changes on the psychosocial work environment: Changes in psychological and social working conditions following organizational changes. Frontiers in Psychology, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02845>
- Hafeez, I., Yingjun, Z., Hafeez, S., Mansoor, R., & Rehman, K. U. (2019). Impact of workplace environment on employee performance: Mediating role of employee health. Business, Management and Education, 17(2), 173-193. <https://doi.org/10.3846/bme.2019.10379>
- Hamed, S., Hussain, M. R., Jani, H. H., Sabri, S. S., & Rusli, N. (2023). The impacts of the physical workplace environment (PWE) on employees' productivity. International Journal of Business and Technology Management, 5(4), 369-376. <https://doi.org/10.55057/ijbtm.2023.5.4.33>
- Herrity, J. (2023). 5 Types of work environments (and how to find the one for you). Indeed. <https://tinyurl.com/4efxambt>
- Humanica. (2024, June 25). What are employee compensation and benefits? Humanica. <https://tinyurl.com/mw5zk5vw>
- International Association for the Study of Pain. (2022, March 14). 2021 Global year about back pain - International association for the study of pain (IASP). International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP). <https://tinyurl.com/mscwttu2>
- Kamalulil, E. N., & Panatik, S. A. (2024). Psychosocial work environments and well-being among employees: Findings from a systematic review. <https://tinyurl.com/3882f59z>
- Kegel, P. (2019). The impact of the physical work environment on organizational outcomes: A structured review of the literature. Journal of Facility Management Education and Research, 1(1), 19-29. <https://doi.org/10.22361/jfmer/76637>
- Kelly, E. L., Berkman, L. F., Kubzansky, L. D., & Lovejoy, M. (2021, December 8). 7 Strategies to improve your employees' health and well-being. Harvard Business Review. <https://tinyurl.com/2z5s4m9h>
- Lianablatnik. (2023, May 28). What is a Likert Scale? ClearSurvey. <https://tinyurl.com/4z4t6x8v>
- Maqsoom, A., Mughees, A., Zahoor, H., Nawaz, A., & Mazher, K. M. (2019). Extrinsic psychosocial stressors and workers' productivity: Impact of employee age and industry experience. Applied Economics, 52(26), 2807-2820. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2019.1696936>
- Mason, A. (2024, January 12). The workplace as a competitive advantage. <https://tinyurl.com/yc5rw2tf>
- McCombes, S. (2019, May 15). Descriptive research design. Definition, methods & examples. Scribbr. <https://tinyurl.com/fv343v3u>
- Mora, Z., Suharyanto, A., & Yahya, M. (2020). Effect of work safety and work health towards employees' productivity in PT. Sisirau Aceh Tamiang. Burns, 2(1), 753-760. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.887>
- Nahyan, M. T. A., Ahababi, J. M. A., Alabdulrahman, M. A., Alhosani, I., Jabeen, F., & Farouk, S. (2024). Employee job security and job performance: The mediating role of well-being and the moderating role of perceived organizational support and psychological capital. European Journal of Management and Business Economics. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejmb-01-2023-0011>

- Nee, C., & Yunus, M. (2020). RollRoll Dice: An effective method to improve writing skills among year 3 pupils in constructing SVOA sentences. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080621>
- Perry, E. (2023, May 26). How to build a healthy workplace environment. BetterUp. <https://tinyurl.com/48a7tznb>
- Pimpong, M. (2023). Work environmental factors and its impact on employee productivity: The mediating role of employee commitment. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 916–935. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.2023482>
- Rastrullo, Z. (2023, March 31). Understanding workplace dynamics and their impact on your organization. Outsource Accelerator. <https://tinyurl.com/mu98tkrp>
- Rodriguez, R. S. R. (2021, August 9). What is the workplace environment and why is it important? » ifeel - EN. <https://tinyurl.com/3zcdvj8p>
- Roopavathi, S., & Kulothungan, K. (2021). The impact of work-life balance on employee performance. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Cycle Research* 12(10):31 <https://tinyurl.com/mrdnmkpe>
- Saidu, A. Y., Hyginus, O. O., & Eke, G. J. (2021). Effect of workplace physical environment on the productivity of employees in public organization: A study of the Central Bank of Nigeria, Jalingo Branch, Taraba State. *Noble International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(1), 1–13. <https://tinyurl.com/muue2h3v>
- Sevy, J. O., Sina, R. E., & Varacallo, M. A. (2023). Carpal tunnel syndrome. In StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing. <https://tinyurl.com/mryz6j2z>
- Shaari, R., Sarip, A., & Ramadhinda, S. (2022). A study of the influence of physical work environments on employee performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences*, 12(12). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i12/15975>
- Sombret, P. (2024, May 14). 7 Ways technology has affected the modern workplace. <https://tinyurl.com/2r4mpvux>
- Sproston, C. (2022, March 23). What is flexible furniture, and why is it so popular in modern offices? Blueprint Interiors. <https://tinyurl.com/mweudcyt>
- Stryker, C. (2024, February 20). What is employee productivity? *IBM*. <https://tinyurl.com/2reur5n5>
- Urbanavičiūtė, I., Massoudi, K., Toscanelli, C., & De Witte, H. (2021). On the dynamics of the psychosocial work environment and employee well-being: A latent transition approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(9), 4744. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18094744>
- Wellable. (2023, May 22). Importance of employee health in the workplace. Wellable. <https://tinyurl.com/yk4nrttk>