

Employee Sustainable Intervention Program for the Department of Social Welfare and Development: The Case of Regional Office V

Jinky A. Mangampo

University of Santo Tomas – Legazpi, Legazpi City, Philippines

Author Email: jinky.mangampo@ust-legazpi.edu.ph

Date received: February 3, 2025

Date revised: February 18, 2025

Date accepted: March 7, 2025

Originality: 99%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 1%

Recommended citation:

Mangampo, J. (2025). Employee sustainable intervention program for the Department of Social Welfare and Development: The case of Regional Office V. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(4), 32-55.

<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.055>

Abstract. Human resource management faces rapid changes due to societal and technological shifts, impacting workplace dynamics. In the public sector, voluntary resignations disrupt service continuity and performance, challenging agencies like the Department of Social Welfare and Development Regional Office V (DSWD RO V) in the Philippines. This study addresses a critical gap in understanding and addressing employee turnover in public sector organizations by designing an intervention program focused on improving retention, job satisfaction, and workplace support in alignment with the agency's mission of service excellence. The study used a mixed-method approach to collect data from surveys and interviews with DSWD RO V employees, management, and former staff. Results revealed key turnover drivers, including poor work-life balance, job insecurity, limited career growth, insufficient recognition, uneven workloads, and inadequate resources. The study recommends implementing integrated retention strategies to address these factors and promote a sustainable, employee-centered environment. The findings contribute significantly to the field by offering actionable solutions for public sector organizations facing similar challenges. Implementing these strategies will strengthen DSWD RO V's workforce and enable it to achieve its mission more effectively. Furthermore, this study provides practical implications for organizational policy and enriches the broader discourse on human resource management in the public sector.

Keywords: Employee retention; Intervention program; Public sector workforce; Work-life balance.

1.0 Introduction

The public sector is essential for a country's economic growth, functioning as the backbone of national progress. It encompasses a diverse range of government organizations, including National Government Agencies (NGAs), Local Government Units (LGUs), Government-Owned and Controlled Corporations (GOCCs), Government Financial Institutions (GFIs), and State Universities and Colleges (SUCs). These entities handle key responsibilities such as policymaking, infrastructure development, and delivering vital services like education, healthcare, and public safety. With over 1.7 million employees in 2021, the public sector represents the country's largest workforce. However, it faces a significant challenge: high voluntary turnover rates among employees, which disrupt service delivery, lower service quality, and increase costs.

Despite the perceived job security and benefits of public sector roles, turnover persists, as noted by recent studies. Sowa (2021) highlights the importance of understanding why employees leave and the potential of effective human resource management (HRM) policies in addressing this issue. Similarly, Cregård and Corin (2019)

identify inadequate administrative support and unmet expectations as critical factors driving turnover. Hur's (2019) meta-analysis emphasizes the influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement on employees' intentions to stay or leave. These findings suggest that current HRM strategies in the public sector may not fully address employee expectations and organizational alignment.

The Philippine government has implemented initiatives to improve retention, such as the Civil Service Commission's (CSC) Memorandum Circular No. 6, series of 2022, which introduced flexible work arrangements to promote employee well-being during emergencies. Another significant measure is Executive Order No. 64, series of 2024, which revises salary structures to ensure fair compensation for government employees. Additionally, HRM policies now emphasize creating supportive work environments that prioritize employees' physical, emotional, and social well-being. However, persistent turnover rates suggest that these measures may not address underlying issues such as poor working conditions, limited career growth opportunities, and misaligned organizational goals (Har & Hawley, 2020; Scussiato et al., 2019).

This study seeks to address these challenges by examining sustainable strategies to improve employee retention, motivation, and performance within the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) Regional Office V. The findings aim to provide actionable insights for enhancing HRM practices in the broader public sector, ultimately strengthening employee commitment and improving public service delivery. Moreover, the research will support the Civil Service Commission (CSC) in refining policies to stabilize the government workforce. On an academic level, it will inform curriculum improvements at the University of Santo Tomas-Legazpi, offering case studies for organizational behavior and HRM courses. Ultimately, this study aspires to contribute to the well-being of public sector employees, advance the DSWD's mission, and promote sustainable public service delivery nationwide.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The study employed a mixed-methods approach, incorporating quantitative and qualitative research design methods to gain a comprehensive understanding of the research problem (Ishtiaq, 2019). By combining these two approaches, the study explored existing conditions, relationships, opinions, ongoing processes, and emerging trends with greater depth and breadth. The quantitative component utilized a structured survey questionnaire to collect numerical data, which was analyzed using statistical techniques to draw objective conclusions and generalize findings from the respondents' responses. Complementing this, the qualitative aspect employed an open-ended interview guide to gather detailed insights into specific organizational contexts and events. Unlike the quantitative approach, the qualitative method focused on understanding particular cases and generating rich, descriptive data, rather than aiming for generalization. By employing both methods, this study achieved a balance between objectivity and contextual understanding, enhancing its overall relevance and reliability. This mixed-methods approach allowed the researchers to address the research problem holistically, leveraging the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative perspectives.

2.2 Research Participants

The study involved a total of 438 participants divided into three groups: DSWD RO V Management, including heads of various sections, offices, and units; rank-and-file employees; and former or separated employees. The participants were selected through a stratified random sampling technique to ensure an ideal representation of each area of assignment. Of the 438 participants, 378 responded, resulting in an 86.30% response rate. For the quantitative phase, all 378 participants completed the structured survey questionnaire, providing numerical data for statistical analysis. Simultaneously, the qualitative phase also involved the same group of respondents, who answered the open-ended interview questions included in the instrument.

2.3 Research Instrument

The instruments used in this research are survey questionnaires and an open-ended interview guide. Two sets of instruments were prepared for three distinct sets of respondents: DSWD RO V Management and Heads of Divisions, Sections, and Offices, rank-and-file employees, and former or separated employees of the Department. The first set of instruments combines the survey questionnaire and interview guide, intended to be answered by the first and second groups of respondents. The researcher has adapted Part I from the exit interview form utilized

by DSWD RO V, with necessary modifications. All other sections or parts of the questionnaire are derived from the researcher's conceptualizations, drawing from a synthesis of multiple research studies analyzed during the research process. The questionnaire is composed of five (5) parts. Part I includes the evaluation of the respondents based on their perception or experience of the status of DSWD RO V human resource management practices or conditions along various indicators using a Likert Scale rating. Part II uses a checklist to determine the positive indicators that the respondents perceived as either absent, inadequate, or needs improvement that contribute to factors influencing employee turnover at DSWD RO V. Part III identifies the level of agreement of the respondents regarding the effects of employee turnover on various areas within DSWD RO V using a Likert Scale. Part IV is an open-ended interview questionnaire to gather suggestions and recommendations from the respondents as to the necessary fundamental components of an employee sustainable intervention program or initiative for DSWD RO V to address the underlying causes of employee turnover and enhance employee retention, thereby facilitating the delivery of more effective and client-responsive services.

Another instrument used in this study is a combination of a survey questionnaire and an interview guide, specifically designed for former and separated employees of DSWD RO V. Adapted and modified from the Vanderbilt Human Resources Exit Interview, this instrument aims to collect detailed insights into the separation experiences of these employees. It includes closed-ended and open-ended questions to evaluate various aspects of their employment experiences and perceptions of their reasons for leaving. To ensure the instrument's validity and reliability, it underwent a thorough review by the institution's panel members and was tested before its dissemination to the identified respondents. The researcher conducted a dry run with ten (10) rank-and-file employees, who were not part of the final sample. These employees provided valuable feedback, comments, and recommendations on the clarity, relevance, and structure of the survey and interview questions. The feedback from the dry run helped identify any ambiguities or potential biases in the instrument. Based on these inputs, the researcher made necessary revisions to improve the instrument, ensuring it accurately addressed the research objectives and measured the intended variables. After incorporating the recommendations, the refined instrument was submitted to the institution's review panel for final approval. Once approved, the instrument was reproduced and administered to the intended respondents.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

Before distributing the instruments, the researcher obtained permission from the Regional Director of DSWD RO V and followed the DSWD research protocol by submitting the necessary documents to the Research Evaluation Committee. Following approval, the researcher worked with the Human Resource Management and Development Division (HRMDD) to obtain the contact information of the identified participants. Participants were informed about the study via email and messenger, including details about the questionnaire, interview guide, and consent form. Given the geographical distances of the participants, the researcher chose to distribute the instruments using Google Forms, which allowed for efficient and accessible data collection. The HRMDD assisted with the distribution process, ensuring the instruments reached the intended participants. Participants were provided with a two-week window to complete the instruments, allowing ample time for thoughtful responses. Throughout this period, the researcher remained available to clarify any questions or concerns regarding the instruments. Additionally, follow-up communications were conducted to remind participants of the deadline. While awaiting responses, the researcher also reviewed additional data provided by the HR Department and other publicly available sources, enriching the study and adding further depth to the analysis and interpretation of the results.

2.5 Data Analysis

Various statistical tools were applied to analyze the data, including frequency counts to summarize scores and identify patterns, percentages to compare different figures, and ranking to determine the relative importance of options – weighted means evaluating respondents' perceptions and work experiences across various job aspects. Additionally, thematic analysis was employed to interpret and analyze the responses to the open-ended interview guide from both groups of respondents. This involved systematically coding the data to extract key ideas and concepts and identifying patterns and themes, ensuring that significant insights and meanings from the responses were accurately captured and incorporated into the development of the employee sustainable intervention program.

2.6 Ethical Consideration

To ensure ethical standards, the researcher first sought approval from the Regional Director of DSWD RO V by submitting a formal request to conduct the research and obtain relevant data, adhering to the DSWD research protocol and fulfilling all requirements before starting the study. After receiving approval, survey questionnaires with incorporated consent forms were distributed to the respondents via Google Forms. A copy of the final paper will also be submitted to DSWD RO V upon approval by the panel, serving as a reference for potential future policy development and enhancement and fulfilling the requirements of the Department's Research Evaluation Committee. During the data collection process, strict adherence to research protocols was maintained, ensuring that all data collected from DSWD RO V remained confidential and was used solely for research purposes, in compliance with the Data Privacy Act. Respondent information and responses were securely handled, with participants given the option to remain anonymous. The researcher ensured that no information collected would be used against the respondents, and all data would be used exclusively for research purposes.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Status of Human Resource Practices

Organizational Leadership

Table 1 evaluates the respondents' perceptions regarding the status of DSWD RO V human resource practices, conditions, and organizational leadership. The findings indicate that the leadership at DSWD RO V is generally perceived as effective, with strong strategic planning and communication scores. Most respondents agree that the Department provides clear vision and direction, fostering engagement and motivation (Breau et al., 2018). Communication of goals scored an overall mean of 4.18, resonating strongly with rank-and-file employees who are well-informed and follow directives effectively. For fostering transparency and open communication, the rating was "good" but with room for improvement, especially among management, who gave a mean score of 3.92. Management seeks greater transparency and openness. Support for professional development was rated positively, but budget constraints hinder full implementation of development mechanisms. Aligning with Ozdemir (2024), leadership's commitment to employee growth is vital for retention and effectiveness.

Table 1. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Organizational Leadership*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Demonstrates a clear vision and direction.	4.24	4.41	4.32	Good
2. Effectively communicates organizational goals and expectations to employees.	4.06	4.31	4.18	Good
3. Fosters a culture of transparency and open communication.	3.92	4.19	4.06	Good
4. Support for professional development.	4.10	4.24	4.17	Good
5. Concern with quality and excellence.	4.18	4.33	4.25	Good
6. Practice coaching and mentoring to address skills gaps.	3.73	4.14	3.93	Moderate
7. Decision-making processes are transparent and inclusive.	3.67	4.08	3.87	Moderate
8. The organization's leadership fosters a positive work environment.	3.73	4.21	3.97	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.95	4.24	4.10	Good

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Very good, 4.00-4.49 = Good, 3.00-3.99 = Moderate, 2.00-2.99 = Poor, 1.00-1.99 = Very Poor

Quality and excellence scored highly, with a mean of 4.25, reflecting strong organizational standards and accreditation. However, coaching and mentoring practices received a mean score of 3.93, the lowest among indicators. Limited time and heavy workloads hinder supervisors from adequately supporting newly hired employees, an issue management acknowledges. Institutionalizing these practices could address skills gaps, as emphasized by Ramamoorthy (2022). Transparency and inclusiveness in decision-making scored 3.87, highlighting a need for improvement. Transparent decision-making fosters employee engagement and a sense of ownership (Bedi et al., 2022). Similarly, perceptions of the work environment were generally positive, though management rated it lower than rank-and-file employees, likely due to greater awareness of organizational challenges. A positive environment is crucial for job satisfaction and retention (Ghani, 2022). While leadership is rated positively, areas such as coaching and mentoring, decision-making transparency, and work environment require attention. Rank-and-file employees rated leadership more favorably than management, reflecting differing

perspectives on organizational challenges. Addressing these issues could enhance leadership effectiveness, employee satisfaction, and organizational performance.

Compensation

Table 2 illustrates the evaluation of the perceptions of the same group of respondents regarding the status of DSWD RO V human resource practices or conditions along with compensation.

Table 2. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Compensation*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Competitive compensation package.	4.35	4.40	4.37	Good
2. Presence of competitive bonuses/premiums.	4.39	4.34	4.36	Good
3. Efficient/on-time salary schedule.	4.59	4.49	4.54	Very Good
4. Efficient/on-time reimbursement processing for travel expenses and allowances.	3.43	3.41	3.42	Moderate
5. Benefits provided by DSWD RO V meet the needs and expectations of the employees (based on the employee's role).	3.96	4.09	4.02	Good
6. Salary ranges and scales for different job levels.	4.26	4.32	4.29	Good
7. Compensation adjustments and raises are handled fairly and transparently.	4.39	4.34	4.36	Good
Overall Mean	4.20	4.20	4.20	Good

The Competitive Compensation Package at DSWD RO V received a "Good" rating with an overall mean score of 4.37, indicating that employees perceive the package as competitive and aligned with or exceeding industry standards due to compliance with the Salary Standardization Law for government agencies (EO No. 64, s. 2024). Bonuses and premiums were also rated "Good," with management scoring 4.39 and rank-and-file employees slightly lower at 4.34, averaging 4.36. COS workers receiving monthly premiums contributes to the competitiveness of these benefits. Efficient and timely salary schedules received the highest rating of "Very Good" (overall mean 4.54), reflecting strong satisfaction. Salaries are paid five days earlier than typical cut-offs, reinforcing literature on the importance of reliable compensation (Breaugh et al., 2018). However, the processing of reimbursements for travel expenses and allowances scored lower at 3.42, indicating inefficiencies and delays often due to incomplete submissions and complex approval processes, consistent with Lazear's (2019) findings on delays diminishing satisfaction.

Benefits provided by DSWD RO V were rated "Good" (4.02 overall), with rank-and-file employees scoring higher (4.09) than management (3.96). Management's lower score highlights issues such as "ad hoc" roles with insufficient compensation. The fairness of salary ranges scored "Good" (4.29 overall), indicating success in maintaining equitable pay scales. Similarly, compensation adjustments and raises were rated "Good" (4.36 overall), reflecting these processes' perceptions of fairness and transparency. While DSWD RO V's compensation practices are generally well-regarded, addressing areas for improvement, such as reimbursement delays and the formalization of leadership roles, could enhance satisfaction, retention, and organizational performance.

Job Functions

Table 3 shows the respondents' perceptions of the current human resource practices or conditions along job functions. The evaluation of job functions at DSWD RO V reveals varied perceptions across key indicators. Regarding clearly defined roles and responsibilities, management and rank-and-file employees provided ratings of 4.12 and 4.30, respectively, with an overall "Good" score of 4.21, highlighting effective job structuring and alignment (Khan et al., 2019). However, workload manageability scored lower, with management at 3.59 and employees at 3.83, resulting in a "Moderate" score of 3.71, reflecting concerns about high demands and burnout common in public organizations (Maslach, 2021). Employee empowerment in decision-making was rated 3.90 by management and 4.07 by employees, yielding a "Moderate" 3.98, suggesting some autonomy but room for improvement.

Table 3. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Job Function*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Employees have clearly defined job roles and responsibilities within DSWD RO V.	4.12	4.30	4.21	Good
2. The workload assigned to employees is manageable and reasonable within the time allocated.	3.59	3.83	3.71	Moderate
3. Employees feel empowered to make decisions within their job functions.	3.90	4.07	3.98	Moderate
4. Job functions met expectations.	3.94	4.08	4.01	Good
5. Alignment of job functions with organizational goals and objectives	4.12	4.21	4.16	Good
6. Alignment of job roles with the skills and qualifications of the employees.	3.79	4.16	3.97	Moderate
7. Availability of resources and tools to perform job functions.	3.65	3.93	3.79	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.87	4.08	3.98	Moderate

Job functions meeting expectations received a "Good" rating of 4.01, though lower management scores pointed to challenges like overburdened roles with insufficient compensation. Alignment with organizational goals achieved a "Good" score of 4.16, reflecting strong strategic alignment (Lee et al., 2020). However, job role alignment with skills and qualifications scored "Moderate" at 3.97, with management emphasizing the need for career pathing programs. Resource availability, rated at 3.79 overall, highlighted performance shortages consistent with public sector resource challenges (Schoeman et al., 2023). DSWD RO V's HR practices earned a "Moderate" mean of 3.98, with significant opportunities to improve workload management, empowerment, skill alignment, and resource provision to enhance effectiveness and satisfaction.

Working Conditions

Table 4 presents the respondents' perceptions of current human resource practices related to working conditions. The assessment of working conditions at DSWD RO V highlights several key indicators, emphasizing strengths and improvement areas. The physical work environment received a moderate rating (mean = 3.82), suggesting acceptability but with opportunities to enhance factors like lighting, space, and employee density, as confirmed by observations of inadequate ventilation and space in Municipal Operation Offices (MOOs) due to reliance on LGU-provided facilities (Zhenjing et al., 2022). Resources and equipment also garnered a moderate score (mean = 3.96), with issues like supply delays and budget constraints leading to gaps in meeting employee needs, consistent with findings by Chuang et al. (2019) on the importance of effective supply management.

Table 4. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Working Conditions*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. The physical work environment at DSWD RO V (assigned area of assignment) is conducive to productivity and well-being. (lighting, cubicle position, office employees' volume, etc.).	3.71	3.93	3.82	Moderate
2. Employees are provided Necessary resources and equipment to perform their jobs effectively (tables, chairs, computers, office supplies, etc.).	3.92	4.00	3.96	Moderate
3. Appropriate measures are taken to ensure the health and safety of its employees.	3.88	4.05	3.96	Moderate
4. Safety protocols or compliance with health and safety regulations.	3.88	4.15	4.01	Good
5. There are policies for work-life balance or grievance procedures for addressing workplace concerns.	3.94	4.04	3.99	Moderate
6. The work environment is free from discrimination and harassment.	4.06	4.33	4.19	Good
7. Localization of the area of assignments is being implemented.	3.67	3.94	3.80	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.86	4.06	3.96	Moderate

Health and safety measures scored moderately (mean = 3.96), with room to mitigate payouts and field activities risks. In contrast, adherence to safety protocols earned a slightly higher rating (mean = 4.01), reflecting the organization's commitment to RA 11058 and awareness programs. Work-life balance policies and grievance

procedures were rated moderate (mean = 3.99), with potential improvements needed in implementation and funding to align these programs with organizational mandates (Handayani et al., 2023). The work environment's inclusivity was rated "Good" (mean = 4.19), supported by compliance with RA 11313 and anti-discrimination measures, although minor enhancements are possible. Localization of assignments scored moderately (mean = 3.80), with challenges stemming from applicant distribution and the prioritization of employees' health and safety needs. While DSWD RO V's working conditions are generally acceptable, focused efforts on these key areas are essential to further support employee productivity and well-being.

Growth and Development

Table 5 presents the mean distribution regarding the status of current human resource practices related to growth and development experienced by both DSWD RO V management, including heads of various offices, and rank-and-file employees.

Table 5. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Growth and Development*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. DSWD RO V provides adequate opportunities for professional growth and career advancement.	4.15	3.85	4.00	Good
2. Employees receive adequate training and development programs to enhance their skills.	4.23	3.92	4.08	Good
3. The organization supports continuous learning and development of employees to achieve their career goals and aspirations.	4.12	4.18	4.15	Good
4. Employees have access to mentoring or coaching programs.	3.82	3.99	3.90	Moderate
5. Availability of interventions for identifying and addressing skills gap among employees.	3.67	3.96	3.82	Moderate
6. Availability and execution of career path planning initiatives (Individual Development Plan).	3.65	4.00	3.82	Moderate
7. Career goals are aligned with the opportunities provided by the Department (career pathing).	3.55	3.99	3.77	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.88	3.98	3.94	Moderate

The assessment of growth and development practices at DSWD RO V reveals generally positive perceptions with significant areas for improvement. Opportunities for professional growth, such as scholarships and short-term courses, received an overall mean rating of 4.00 ("Good"). However, rank-and-file employees rated these opportunities lower (3.85) compared to management (4.15), indicating challenges in accessibility due to constraints like limited slots and demanding workloads (Medaris, 2023). Training and development programs also scored well (4.08), but gaps persist, particularly for lower-level employees such as COS workers, who face restrictions on specialized training eligibility. Organizational support for continuous learning was rated similarly across all levels (4.15), reflecting positive perceptions of initiatives like advanced studies and study leave provisions. However, COS workers must balance these with their duties.

Mentoring and coaching programs were rated as "Moderate" (3.90), reflecting limited utilization due to heavy supervisor workloads, with existing tools primarily used reactively rather than proactively. Research supports the value of effective mentorship in bridging skill gaps and fostering career growth (River, 2023). Similarly, initiatives to identify and address skill gaps were rated 3.82 ("Moderate"), hindered by budget and time constraints, consistent with findings that structured training programs enhance employee performance (Birou et al., 2019). Career path planning also scored 3.82, indicating a lack of effective monitoring and execution due to funding limitations. Lastly, alignment of career goals with organizational opportunities received a "Moderate" rating (3.94), with administrative roles particularly affected by mismatched assignments. At the same time, regulated professions like social workers and lawyers generally align better with career paths. Overall, the mean score of 3.94 suggests that while growth and development practices are acceptable, there are notable discrepancies in access and implementation, particularly for rank-and-file employees. Enhanced mentoring, career planning, and more equitable program accessibility could improve the consistency and effectiveness of these initiatives.

Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Table 6 presents the perceptions and experiences of the DSWD RO V management, including heads of various offices and rank-and-file employees, on human resource practices, mainly focusing on the supervisor-subordinate relationship.

Table 6. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Supervisors within DSWD RO V effectively support and guide their subordinates.	4.12	4.28	4.20	Good
2. Supervisors promote teamwork and collaboration among team members.	4.18	4.34	4.26	Good
3. There is open and constructive communication between supervisors and subordinates.	4.10	4.24	4.17	Good
4. Supervisors provide regular feedback and recognition for their subordinates' work.	3.94	4.18	4.06	Good
5. Supervisors treat employees fairly and respectfully.	4.20	4.27	4.24	Good
6. Supervisors encourage professional growth and development among their subordinates.	4.24	4.28	4.26	Good
7. Supervisors are approachable and available to address concerns and issues.	4.22	4.31	4.26	Good
Overall Mean	4.14	4.27	4.20	Good

The data illustrate that all aspects of the supervisor-subordinate relationship are rated as “Good.” This suggests that both management and rank-and-file employees perceive that supervisors are generally effective in providing support and actively promoting a collaborative work environment, the communication channels between supervisors and subordinates are relatively strong, feedback is generally provided, there is a strong foundation in how supervisors treat their employees, supervisors support and encourage their employees in terms of professional growth and development, and they are approachable and available to address concerns and issues being raised by their subordinates. However, the lowest rating of 4.06 on whether the supervisors provide regular feedback and recognition for their subordinates' work suggests that while feedback and recognition are generally provided, it may not be as frequent or impactful as they could be. This is possibly due to a lack of time because of the heavy workloads assigned to the supervisors. Research by Grote (2020) shows that timely and constructive feedback is critical for employee development and satisfaction, indicating a need for supervisors to improve in this area. The overall mean of 4.20 or “Good” presents a positive but not perfect picture of the supervisor-subordinate dynamics in DSWD RO V. There remains room for improvement, particularly in feedback and recognition practices that could be enhanced to minimize employee turnover and improve job satisfaction. This aligns with the study of Bateman et al. (2019), which emphasizes the importance of effective leadership in employee productivity and morale.

Organizational Culture

Table 7 evaluates the status of organizational culture within the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) Regional Office V, as perceived by both management and rank-and-file employees. The organizational culture within DSWD RO V is generally perceived as positive, with an overall mean rating of 4.15, falling within the “Good” range (4.00–4.49). This indicates strengths in fostering teamwork, diversity, innovation, and inclusivity. Employees feel that their contributions are valued, ethical behavior is upheld, and collaboration is effective. However, areas for improvement exist, particularly in enhancing employees' sense of belonging and loyalty, which received the lowest overall score of 4.00 and a management rating of 3.78. This finding aligns with Meyer et al. (2021), who emphasize the importance of belonging in improving retention and job satisfaction. Recognition of employee contributions also needs attention, with a score of 4.04 overall and 3.92 from management, suggesting that while mechanisms for appreciation exist, they may be inconsistently applied, especially at leadership levels. Enhancing recognition practices could significantly boost morale, as highlighted by Aguinis et al. (2019), who found that even small gestures of acknowledgment can improve engagement and retention. Ethical behavior scored 4.08 overall, with a management rating of 3.88, indicating that while integrity is generally upheld, occasional lapses may occur. Addressing these gaps could further strengthen the department’s culture, which is already well-regarded for promoting collaboration, creativity, and inclusivity, positioning it for sustained growth.

Table 7. Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Organizational Culture

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. The organizational culture within DSWD promotes teamwork and collaboration.	4.10	4.29	4.20	Good
2. Diversity and inclusion are valued and respected within the Department.	4.12	4.37	4.24	Good
3. Appreciation of employee contributions are highly valued by the Department.	3.92	4.15	4.04	Good
4. DSWD RO V fosters a culture of innovation and continuous improvement.	4.22	4.33	4.28	Good
5. The Department promotes ethical behavior and integrity in all its practices.	3.88	4.27	4.08	Good
6. Employees feel a strong sense of belonging and loyalty to the DSWD RO V.	3.78	4.22	4.00	Good
7. The Department effectively communicates its values and mission to all employees.	4.10	4.33	4.22	Good
Overall Mean	4.02	4.28	4.15	Good

Work-Life Balance

Table 8 illustrates the status of human resource management practices or conditions at DSWD RO V and work-life balance from both management and rank-and-file employees' perspectives.

Table 8. Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Work-Life Balance

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. DSWD RO V promotes employee well-being and engages in various health and wellness activities and initiatives to achieve work-life balance.	4.12	4.16	4.14	Good
2. The Department respects the personal time of employees outside working hours.	3.49	3.79	3.64	Moderate
3. The organization offers flexible work arrangements (e.g., WFH, flexitime) to accommodate employees' needs.	4.14	3.99	4.06	Good
4. Employees feel supported in managing their personal and professional responsibilities.	3.98	4.04	4.01	Good
5. The Department provides adequate leave options (e.g., vacation, sick leave) to support work-life balance.	4.38	4.27	4.32	Good
6. Employees are not expected to work beyond their scheduled hours unless necessary.	3.86	3.94	3.90	Moderate
7. The Department offers support services, such as counseling or stress management programs, to help employees maintain work-life balance.	3.65	3.79	3.72	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.94	4.00	3.97	Moderate

The Department of Social Welfare and Development Regional Office V (DSWD RO V) received a "Good" rating (mean of 4.14) from both management and rank-and-file employees for promoting well-being through health and wellness initiatives. However, some staff struggle to participate due to workload demands. The department's respect for employees' time was rated "Moderate," reflecting challenges during critical operations, such as disaster response, when employees must prioritize work, even outside office hours, compromising their time. This aligns with the findings by Kelly et al. (2021), who noted that work-life conflict arises when organizational demands infringe on personal time, leading to stress and burnout. Flexible work arrangements were also rated "Good" (4.06).

However, full implementation remains limited to the Regional Office, with lower ratings (3.99) from rank-and-file employees, echoing Waizenegger et al.'s (2020) assertion of the importance of flexibility for work-life balance. Organizational support for balancing personal and professional responsibilities scored a "Good" (4.01), though management and employees agree there is room for improvement. Leave options received a 4.32 "Good" rating, with adequate provisions for permanent, contractual, and casual employees. However, COS workers rely on compensatory days off or overtime pay, underscoring Allen et al.'s (2022) emphasis on the necessity of leave for well-being. However, the "Moderate" ratings for boundaries on work hours and support services like counseling

highlight the impact of high workloads and the underutilization or lack of awareness of available resources. The overall mean of 3.97 suggests that while DSWD RO V has commendable initiatives, significant gaps in workload management, personal time respect, and support services need addressing to improve work-life balance and employee well-being.

Recognition and Reward

Table 9 describes the responses from management and rank-and-file employees regarding the status of human resource management practices or conditions at DSWD RO V, along with rewards and recognition.

Table 9. *Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Recognition and Reward*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. DSWD FO V provides adequate recognition and rewards for employees' contributions.	3.96	4.08	4.02	Good
2. The Department links organizational goals to recognition.	4.04	4.11	4.08	Good
3. It encourages peer-to-peer recognition.	3.80	3.99	3.90	Moderate
4. The supervisors provide commendation in IPCR to their respective employees.	3.80	4.14	3.97	Moderate
5. Recognition practices are consistently applied across all levels of the Department.	3.80	4.02	3.91	Moderate
6. The Department celebrates achievements and milestones in a meaningful way.	3.92	4.17	4.04	Good
7. Employees feel their efforts are valued and appreciated by the organization.	3.65	4.04	3.84	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.85	4.08	3.96	Moderate

The recognition and rewards system at DSWD RO V, with an overall rating of 4.02, indicates that while a program is in place, there is room for improvement. The annual PRAISE program recognizes employees for excellence and is limited by strict criteria that may exclude many. Recognition could be more personalized and inclusive, focusing on individual achievements across all employment types. Management's slightly lower rating reflects the need for more frequent and simple acts of appreciation, particularly for those in leadership roles (Brun et al., 2018). The alignment between recognition and organizational goals, rated 4.08, shows employees appreciate how recognition is linked to broader objectives. However, they suggest more transparent communication of how individual contributions support these goals.

The PRAISE program's use of the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) system, which requires employees to demonstrate significant contributions and strong work ethics, supports this connection (Williams et al., 2019). Peer-to-peer recognition, with a rating of 3.90, suggests that while efforts are made, it is not consistently embraced. The lack of formal mechanisms for peer recognition limits its effectiveness, though McCarthy et al. (2020) highlight its value in fostering collaboration. Similarly, the practice of supervisor commendations in the IPCR, rated 3.97, suffers from inconsistency. However, recent changes to the form may improve feedback quality, aligning with Saks & Gruman's (2021) emphasis on supervisor recognition. The moderate rating of 3.91 for consistency across levels suggests that recognition is not uniformly applied, requiring standardization to ensure all employees feel equally valued.

While the department celebrates achievements and milestones with an overall rating of 4.04, management feels these celebrations could be more meaningful. Despite these strengths, the overall sense of being valued, rated 3.84, points to a gap between recognition efforts and employee experiences, particularly among leaders who report feeling under-recognized. Personalized and simple gestures could significantly impact, aligning with Gallup's (2022) findings on the importance of feeling valued for employee engagement. DSWD RO V's recognition and rewards practices are foundational but require enhancements to improve consistency, peer recognition, and personalized appreciation, which could lead to greater employee satisfaction and engagement (McCarthy et al., 2020; Saks & Gruman, 2021).

Security of Tenure

Table 10 evaluates the status of DSWD Regional Office V's human resource management practices regarding tenure security as perceived by both management, including heads of various offices and rank-and-file employees.

Table 10. Current Status of Human Resource Practices in Terms of Security of Tenure

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. The Department demonstrates a commitment to employee welfare and job security.	3.80	4.00	3.90	Moderate
2. Employees feel secure in their positions and prospects for long-term tenure within the Department.	3.61	3.79	3.70	Moderate
3. The work in DSWD FO V gives a sense of purpose.	4.39	4.41	4.40	Good
4. There is a feeling of personal and professional fulfillment in the Department.	4.04	4.32	4.18	Good
5. The Department provides clear communication about career advancement opportunities.	3.86	4.05	3.96	Moderate
6. Policies regarding layoffs and terminations are transparent and fair	3.73	4.06	3.90	Moderate
7. The Department offers comprehensive retirement and pension plans to support long-term security.	3.88	4.03	3.96	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.90	4.09	4.00	Good

The data reveals that management and rank-and-file employees at DSWD FO V rated the Department's commitment to employee welfare and job security as "Moderate," with an overall mean of 3.90. This suggests that while the organization is somewhat committed to employee welfare, job security policies are underdeveloped, particularly for Contract of Service (COS) workers, who often face uncertainty due to the project-based nature of their positions. The "Moderate" rating indicates a need for stronger and clearer job security policies to boost employee confidence, as job security is vital for retention and motivation (Zatzick & Iverson, 2019). The perception of job security and long-term tenure also received a "Moderate" rating, indicating that short-term contracts and budget constraints contribute to uncertainty among employees, especially COS workers, who may leave for more secure opportunities.

On the other hand, work at DSWD RO V is seen as purposeful and fulfilling, with ratings of 4.40 and 4.18 for personal and professional fulfillment, respectively. This suggests that employees find meaning in their work, which aligns with their personal and professional goals and provides motivation despite job insecurity. This is consistent with Lee et al. (2020), who found that employees with a sense of purpose tend to be more engaged and productive. However, indicators related to career advancement, transparency in termination policies, and retirement plans were also rated as "Moderate," indicating room for improvement in communication and clarity, especially in times of organizational change. Strengthening transparency in career progression and long-term benefits would enhance employee trust and security.

The overall rating of 4.00 for security of tenure reflects a positive work environment. However, it highlights the need to address concerns about job security and career advancement to improve employee satisfaction and retention. The findings also underscore the need to address gaps in HRM practices, with Self-Determination Theory (SDT) emphasizing the importance of meeting employees' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness to foster motivation and productivity. Challenges such as limited job autonomy, inadequate mentoring, and poor work-life balance hinder employee engagement and organizational performance.

3.2 Factors Influencing Employee Turnover

Organizational Leadership

The data in Table 11 provide valuable insights into the factors influencing employee turnover concerning organizational leadership, as viewed by both management and rank-and-file employees. The data reveals that the most critical issue identified by employees at DSWD RO V is the organization's failure to address skills gaps, with 70.23% of respondents highlighting this concern. Despite the Department offering Learning and Development Interventions (LDIs) to permanent and key contractual employees, growth opportunities are limited for those under a Contract of Service (COS), and budget constraints prevent the effective implementation of Individual Development Plans (IDPs). This lack of development opportunities leads to dissatisfaction and higher turnover

rates, as research by Li et al. (2020) suggests that growth opportunities contribute to job satisfaction and retention. The second major issue is the lack of adequate support and feedback mechanisms, with 65.32% of employees reporting this concern. Feedback is essential for employee engagement and morale, and without it, employees may feel undervalued, leading to higher turnover, as Grote (2020) supports.

Table 11. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Organizational Leadership*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. The organization has a clear vision and goals	7	105	112	32.37%
2. Decision-making processes are effective and inclusive	15	168	183	52.89%
3. Communication within the organization is open and transparent	25	191	216	62.43%
4. Leaders demonstrate ethical behavior and integrity	20	175	195	56.36%
5. Employees receive adequate support, and there are effective feedback mechanisms	26	200	226	65.32%
6. The organization actively addresses skills gaps among employees	29	214	243	70.23%
Overall Mean				56.6%

Another key issue is the lack of open and transparent communication, cited by 62.43% of respondents. Poor communication undermines trust and affects employee satisfaction, as shown by Men and Yue (2019). Additionally, 56.36% of employees expressed dissatisfaction with their leaders' ethical behavior and integrity, which can negatively impact workplace culture and retention, as noted by Bedi et al. (2018). The decision-making process also requires improvement, with 52.89% highlighting the need for more inclusive and effective decision-making to foster employee engagement and reduce turnover, as Bella et al. (2023) emphasized. The least pressing issue is the organization's unclear vision and goals, affecting 32.37% of employees, with Kumar and Singh (2020) noting that a clear vision aligns employees' efforts and reduces turnover. Addressing skills development, feedback, communication, ethical leadership, and inclusive decision-making is crucial for improving employee retention and overall organizational effectiveness. Management should prioritize leadership development, communication strategies, and training programs to create a supportive and ethical workplace.

Compensation

Table 12 analyzes how management and rank-and-file employees perceive various compensation-related factors at DSWD Regional Office V that may influence employee turnover.

Table 12. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Compensation*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. Salaries are competitive compared to industry standards	19	165	184	53.18%
2. The compensation structure is fair and transparent	17	165	182	52.60%
3. The benefits package (e.g., health insurance, retirement plans) is comprehensive	19	123	142	41.04%
4. Employees receive performance-based incentives or bonuses	17	179	196	56.65%
5. There are opportunities for salary increases and career advancement	23	176	199	57.51%
6. Reimbursements for travel expenses, allowances, and other benefits are processed efficiently.	30	198	228	65.90%
Overall Mean				54.4%

The survey responses from DSWD Regional Office V employees highlight several pressing concerns regarding compensation, which affects employee satisfaction and retention. The most significant issue, identified by 65.90% of respondents, is the inefficiency of processing reimbursements and allowances, which can take up to six months due to multiple offices involved, incomplete documentation, lack of quality control, and insufficient personnel. This reimbursement delay contributes to employee frustration and dissatisfaction, as timely financial processing is crucial for morale and retention (Baker & Murphy, 2019). The second concern, noted by 57.51% of employees, is the lack of opportunities for salary increases and career advancement. The limited number of promotional

openings and the stringent qualification requirements for key positions create a bottleneck, making many employees feel stagnant in their careers. Additionally, salary increases mandated by the Salary Standardization Law have a ceiling, which may not be sufficient to keep up with inflation and rising living costs. However, government salaries remain competitive compared to the private sector. Research indicates that limited career growth opportunities significantly drive turnover (DeLuca & Wright, 2019).

A third issue, expressed by 56.65% of employees, is the lack of performance-based incentives, particularly affecting the large Contract of Service (COS) workers ineligible for these incentives. Furthermore, 53.18% of employees cited concerns over the competitiveness of salaries relative to industry standards, believing their workloads and experience merit higher compensation. Millan et al. (2020) also emphasize the importance of competitive salaries for employee retention. Transparency and fairness in the compensation structure were a concern for 52.60% of respondents, mainly due to discrepancies between the benefits received by COS employees and those with permanent or contractual status. Lastly, 41.04% of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the benefits package, particularly regarding health insurance and retirement plans, especially for COS workers excluded from such benefits. While this issue ranks lowest, addressing these concerns in the compensation framework is essential to improve employee retention at DSWD RO V, with the efficiency of reimbursement processing being the most urgent factor to address.

Job Functions

Table 13 outlines various aspects of job functions and how they influence employee turnover at DSWD Regional Office V from both management and rank-and-file employees' perspectives.

Table 13. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Job Functions*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. Job descriptions and responsibilities are clearly defined	21	203	224	64.74%
2. Workload and tasks are distributed fairly	21	160	181	52.31%
3. Employees have the autonomy to make decisions within their roles	9	110	119	34.39%
4. Necessary resources and support are available to perform job duties effectively	20	220	240	69.36%
5. Job roles align with employees' skills and interests	18	175	193	55.78%
6. Job functions align with the organization's goals and objectives	10	78	88	25.43%
Overall Mean				50.34%

A prominent concern among respondents is the lack of resources and support necessary for effective job performance, with 69.36% highlighting insufficient office equipment, supplies, information, and managerial assistance. This issue is often a result of budget constraints and logistical challenges, particularly for geographically distant offices. Employees are sometimes forced to purchase supplies themselves, leading to frustration and stress, contributing to turnover (Nguyen & McGuire, 2021). Another concern, raised by 64.74% of respondents, is the lack of clarity regarding job descriptions and responsibilities, leading to unrealistic expectations. Despite the presence of tools like the Individual Performance Commitment (IPC) and Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS), these do not fully capture the scope of employees' roles. This misalignment calls for better coordination of job roles to ensure realistic targets and prevent overload (Bakker & Demerouti, 2018). Additionally, 55.78% of respondents feel their roles do not align with their skills and interests, leading to decreased engagement and increased turnover intentions. Implementing job rotations may help employees find more fulfilling roles (Smith & Lewis, 2020).

Fair workload distribution is also a concern for 52.31% of respondents, with some employees experiencing excessive stress and burnout due to imbalanced task allocation. Proper workload management is essential to maintain morale and reduce turnover (Bakker & Demerouti, 2018). Although 34.39% of employees feel a lack of autonomy, most can make decisions within their roles. Still, some feel micro-managed or require supervisor approval for key decisions, indicating a need for more decision-making freedom (Breugh, 2019). Lastly, 25.43%

of respondents feel their job functions are misaligned with the organization's goals, suggesting that most employees believe their roles support the organization's vision. However, a small group struggles to see the connection, which may impact their engagement (Carter et al., 2021). Addressing these concerns could potentially reduce turnover rates within the organization.

Working Conditions

Table 14 presents insights into how different working conditions influence employee turnover at DSWD Regional Office V based on responses from the management team and rank-and-file employees.

Table 14. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Work Conditions*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. The physical work environment (e.g., office space, equipment, facilities) is adequate	36	181	217	62.72%
2. Safety and health protocols are in place and followed	22	164	186	53.76%
3. Necessary tools and equipment are available	23	165	188	54.34%
4. There is flexibility in work arrangements (e.g., remote work options)	16	159	175	50.58%
5. The work location is accessible and the commute is manageable	19	183	202	58.38%
6. The organization has policies to support work-life balance and address workplace concerns	21	173	194	56.07%
Overall Mean				55.97%

The most significant factor contributing to employee turnover related to working conditions in DSWD RO V is the physical work environment, with 62.72% of respondents expressing dissatisfaction. This includes issues like limited office space, inadequate ventilation, and insufficient facilities, particularly in municipal offices where staff depend on Local Government Units (LGUs) for space. Budget constraints further exacerbate this problem. De Korte et al. (2020) research links inadequate workspaces to lower job satisfaction and higher turnover. Another primary concern is the accessibility of the work location, with 58.38% of respondents facing difficulties with commuting, especially for community workers who deal with long travel times and limited transportation. Chatterjee et al. (2019) suggest that long commutes increase stress and decrease retention. Work-life balance is also a significant issue, with 56.07% of employees noting insufficient policies to manage their personal and professional lives despite existing initiatives. Cruz et al. (2020) found that organizations promoting work-life balance have higher employee retention.

Additionally, 54.34% of employees cite a lack of essential tools and equipment, which affects job performance, with delays in supply delivery exacerbated by budget issues. Reddy et al. (2020) highlight the importance of adequate resources for job satisfaction and retention. Safety and health protocols also received concern from 53.76% of respondents, particularly in fieldwork where community workers face health risks. Nasidin et al. (2020) stress the importance of adequate safety measures to prevent turnover. Lastly, 50.58% of respondents reported a lack of flexible work arrangements. Although some policies exist, their inconsistent application across offices contributes to dissatisfaction. With 55.97% of respondents indicating that these working conditions influence turnover, addressing these issues is crucial for improving employee retention.

Growth and Development

Table 15 reflects how different aspects of growth and development influence employee turnover at DSWD Regional Office V, as perceived by both management, including heads of various DSWD RO V offices, and rank-and-file employees. The data from the study indicate that the primary concern among employees at DSWD RO V is the lack of mentorship and coaching programs, identified by 73.51% of respondents. This suggests a strong desire for more structured guidance and growth opportunities. Despite the availability of resources, mentorship programs are often neglected due to the heavy workloads of leadership, which leaves employees feeling unsupported. The importance of mentorship is underscored by Mullen et al. (2018), who highlighted its role in employee engagement and retention. Furthermore, 61.56% of respondents emphasized the need for professional development and training, which is hindered by budget limitations. Contract workers are restricted to in-house

or free training, resulting in stagnation. Ozdemir (2024) stresses that continuous training is essential for employee retention, especially in government sectors.

Table 15. Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Growth and Development

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. There are opportunities for professional development and training	20	193	213	61.56%
2. Mentorship and coaching programs are available	26	228	254	73.51%
3. Employees have chances for career advancement and promotion	21	183	204	58.96%
4. The organization supports continuing education or certifications	18	169	187	54.05%
5. Employees are exposed to challenging and meaningful work	19	122	141	40.75%
6. Good performance is recognized and appreciated	18	160	178	51.45%
Overall Mean				56.71%

Career advancement also ranked a concern for 58.96% of employees, indicating limited upward mobility. This issue, exacerbated by a high employee-to-position ratio and strict promotion criteria, aligns with Luna-Arocas and Morley (2020), who linked career stagnation to increased turnover. While 54.05% of employees expressed dissatisfaction with the support for continuing education and 51.45% with the recognition of performance, the study found that such opportunities are limited, particularly for non-permanent employees. Rana and Sharma (2022) emphasize that recognition is vital for job satisfaction and retention. On a more positive note, only 40.75% of employees felt their work lacked challenge or meaning, with many perceiving their roles as fulfilling due to the organization's mission to improve lives. Overall, the findings reveal that over half of respondents feel growth and development opportunities are insufficient, directly impacting retention at DSWD RO V. Addressing these concerns could significantly reduce turnover and enhance employee satisfaction.

Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Table 16 outlines the perceptions of both management and rank-and-file employees regarding factors influencing employee turnover in the supervisor-subordinate relationship at DSWD Regional Office V.

Table 16. Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. Communication and feedback from supervisors are frequent	24	168	192	55.49%
2. There is a high level of trust and respect between supervisors and employees	17	125	142	41.04%
3. Supervisors provide adequate support and guidance	21	174	195	56.36%
4. Supervisors are fair and impartial in their treatment of employees	20	87	107	30.92%
5. There are effective mechanisms for resolving conflicts	31	145	176	50.87%
6. Supervisors recognize and appreciate employees' contributions	17	166	183	52.89%
Overall Mean				47.93%

The study highlights several factors in supervisor-subordinate relationships influencing employee turnover at DSWD RO V. The top-ranked issue, cited by 56.36% of respondents, is a perceived lack of supervisory support and guidance, attributed to factors like overwhelmed supervisors, skill gaps, strained relationships, and the "complete staff work" (CSW) culture. This aligns with Nitafan (2020), who underscores the importance of strong supervisory support in enhancing job satisfaction and retention. Communication and feedback, noted by 55.49% of respondents, emerged as another critical area. Men and Yue (2019) emphasize that effective communication fosters engagement and lowers turnover rates. Recognition of employee contributions, with 52.89% of responses, indicates a need for more personalized acknowledgment, consistent with Rana & Sharma's (2022) findings that

regular recognition boosts satisfaction. Conflict resolution mechanisms, identified by 50.87% of respondents, require improved implementation, particularly at provincial levels, as unresolved conflicts increase turnover (Wall & Dunne, 2022). Trust and respect, highlighted by 41.04% of respondents, remain significant, as Bedi et al. (2022) argue that trust is vital for a healthy work environment. Lastly, perceived fairness, cited by 30.92%, suggests most supervisors are impartial, though improvements are needed to address residual concerns. Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara (2020) links perceived unfairness to higher turnover. With 47.93% citing supervisor-subordinate relationships as a turnover factor, leadership training is recommended to address these gaps.

Organizational Culture

Table 17 highlights the perceived deficiencies (absence, insufficiency, or areas needing improvement) in various indicators related to the organizational culture at DSWD RO V, which may contribute to employee turnover.

Table 17. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Organizational Culture*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. The organization's values align with employees' personal values	21	95	116	33.53%
2. There is strong teamwork and collaboration among employees	17	101	118	34.10%
3. The organization practices diversity and inclusion	14	108	122	35.26%
4. Work-life balance policies are promoted and practiced	37	213	250	72.25%
5. Employees are recognized and appreciated for their contributions	22	215	237	68.50%
6. The organization encourages innovation and creativity	10	89	99	28.61%
Overall Mean				45.38%

A survey identified several significant factors contributing to employee turnover, with a deficiency in work-life balance policies leading to the concerns (72.25%). Despite existing wellness initiatives, high workloads and unrealistic targets undermine these efforts, resulting in burnout, a known issue in community development work. Addressing workload management could mitigate turnover, aligning with findings by Casper et al. (2020) highlighting the importance of work-life balance for employee well-being. A lack of personalized recognition was also significant, noted by 68.50% of respondents. While regional recognition programs exist, employees lack tailored approaches, leading to dissatisfaction. Rana and Sharma (2022) emphasize the role of personalized recognition in enhancing engagement and reducing turnover.

Diversity and inclusion were seen as needing improvement by 35.26% of respondents, suggesting gaps in the effective implementation of Gender and Development initiatives, despite police presence. Shore et al. (2018) stress that genuine inclusivity fosters retention by creating a sense of belonging. Teamwork, a core strength, was flagged by 34.10% of respondents for minor issues, underscoring its critical role in community development efforts. Perceived misalignment between organizational and personal values (33.53%) and limited support for innovation and creativity (28.61%) also emerged as concerns, pointing to gaps in embodying values and fostering employee creativity. Addressing these issues could enhance satisfaction and reduce turnover, consistent with research by Amabile and Pratt (2018). While 45.38% of respondents viewed the organizational culture positively, the study recommends improving workload management, diversifying recognition programs, and addressing cultural gaps to enhance retention.

Work-Life Balance

Table 18 highlights the perceived gaps (such as absence, insufficiency, or areas needing improvement) in various work-life balance indicators at DSWD RO V, potentially leading to employee turnover. A study of workplace challenges revealed that 73.41% of respondents identified workload management as the most deficient area, with many employees feeling overburdened by numerous program requirements and unrealistic targets, leading to burnout and turnover. Respect for employees' time ranked second, with 58.96% citing the impact of after-hours demands on work-life balance as a significant concern. Support for family and personal commitments, identified by 53.76% of respondents, is hindered by urgent operational demands, which often require prioritization of work

over personal obligations, even during leave. Stress management and well-being programs were flagged by 49.13% as insufficient, with employees too overwhelmed by workloads to participate in these initiatives.

Table 18. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Work-Life Balance*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. Employees have flexibility in their work schedules	14	150	164	47.40%
2. There are sufficient leave options (e.g., vacation, sick, personal)	8	137	145	41.91%
3. The organization supports employees' family or personal commitments	22	164	186	53.76%
4. Workload management practices are effective	26	228	254	73.41%
5. The organization offers stress management and well-being programs	20	150	170	49.13%
6. The organization respects employees' time off and after-work hours	24	180	204	58.96%
Overall Mean				54.09%

Flexibility in work schedules was highlighted by 47.40% as needing improvement, with inconsistent implementation of flexi-time policies and exclusion of Contract of Service (COS) workers contributing to dissatisfaction. Lastly, while leave options were the least deficient factor at 41.91%, COS workers' lack of entitlement to leave benefits under the "no work, no pay" system affects job satisfaction. Overall, 54.09% of respondents perceived work-life balance as deficient, suggesting the need for improved workload distribution, flexible schedules, wellness programs, and respect for personal time to enhance employee retention and well-being. Research by Masuda et al. (2018), Sonnentag and Fritz (2021), and Allen et al. (2020) supports the importance of family support systems, effective stress management, and flexible work arrangements in reducing turnover.

Recognition and Reward

Table 19 outlines the deficiencies in indicators related to recognition and rewards.

Table 19. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Rewards*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. The performance evaluation and feedback processes are effective	21	185	206	59.54%
2. Employees have opportunities for public recognition or awards	17	152	169	48.84%
3. Non-monetary rewards or incentives are available	23	178	201	58.09%
4. Achievements and milestones are celebrated	21	150	171	49.42%
5. Employees are given opportunities for increased responsibility or leadership roles	23	100	123	35.55%
6. Peer recognition and appreciation are encouraged within the team	20	222	242	69.94%
Overall Mean				54.56%

The study reveals that a lack of peer recognition and appreciation is the most significant issue, with 69.94% of respondents identifying it as a significant deficiency. This reflects a substantial gap in fostering a culture of mutual acknowledgment within DSWD RO V, where the absence of a formal peer-to-peer recognition system exacerbates feelings of undervaluation and contributes to employee turnover. While informal celebrations occur, the lack of structured recognition for professional achievements undermines motivation and satisfaction, increasing the likelihood of turnover. Research by Park et al. (2019) underscores the positive impact of peer recognition on morale and workplace belonging. Performance evaluation and feedback processes rank as the second most deficient factor, with 59.54% of respondents expressing concerns. Despite using the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), feedback is perceived as insufficient and often linked to violations rather than support, leading to disengagement. Grote (2020) emphasizes that constructive feedback enhances performance and strengthens employee-supervisor relationships, reducing turnover.

Additionally, 58.09% of respondents highlight the absence of non-monetary rewards, suggesting missed opportunities to recognize employees' efforts beyond financial compensation. Kuvaas et al. (2019) affirm that non-monetary rewards, such as public acknowledgment and career development opportunities, are critical in reducing turnover. Public recognition and awards are marked as deficient by 48.84% of respondents, and celebrations of milestones (49.42%) are seen as impersonal and superficial, lacking meaningful and individualized gestures, as Eisenberger et al. (2019) noted. Opportunities for leadership roles ranked lowest, with only 35.55% of respondents identifying it as a concern, suggesting relative strength in this area. However, clearer leadership pathways could address feelings of stagnation. 53.56% of respondents consider recognition and rewards inadequate, highlighting the need for improvements to enhance employee retention, satisfaction, and motivation.

Security of Tenure

Table 20 below illustrates the deficiencies in indicators related to tenure security as perceived by both management and rank-and-file employees.

Table 20. *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover in Terms of Security of Tenure*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1. Job stability and security are assured	23	203	226	65.32%
2. Promotion and transfer policies are fair and transparent	18	205	223	64.45%
3. The organization's termination or layoff practices are fair	12	107	119	34.39%
4. Retirement and pension plans are in place	7	142	149	43.06%
5. There are mechanisms for resolving grievances and disputes	28	171	199	57.51%
6. Contract renewals and employment agreements are handled transparently	18	82	100	28.90%
Overall Mean				48.94%

The study identifies significant factors contributing to employee turnover in DSWD RO V, with the most critical being the lack of job security and stability (65.32%). This issue is especially acute among contract-of-service (COS) workers, who represent over half the workforce. Their reliance on temporary contracts tied to program funding and performance creates a sense of instability and aligns with Green's (2018) findings that job insecurity drives turnover in contract-heavy sectors. Perceived unfairness in promotion and transfer policies (64.45%) also undermines employee trust, as employees believe non-meritocratic factors influence decisions, echoing Liu et al. (2020) on the negative impact of perceived unfair practices on job satisfaction. Additionally, 57.51% of respondents reported deficiencies in grievance resolution, particularly at the municipal level, exacerbating dissatisfaction and turnover. Termination, layoff practices (34.39%), and pension plan gaps (43.06%) are less pressing but still problematic, especially for COS workers without pension entitlements, consistent with Blanchflower and Bryson (2022) on the importance of long-term benefits for retention. Lastly, while most respondents find contract renewals transparent, 28.90% perceive a lack of clarity, reinforcing findings by Afonso et al. (2020) on the insecurity faced by contract workers without clear advancement pathways. Overall, the study highlights critical areas for improvement, including job security, promotion transparency, and grievance mechanisms, which disproportionately affect COS workers. Using Human Resource Theory and Social Exchange Theory, the findings underscore the need for DSWD RO V to address gaps in employee support and organizational practices to build trust, enhance engagement, and reduce turnover.

3.3 Effects of Employee Turnover

Personnel

Table 21 presents the level of agreement regarding the effects of employee turnover at DSWD RO V on personnel aspects. The analysis reveals that employee turnover significantly impacts organizations, with an overall mean score of 4.10 indicating strong agreement among respondents that turnover increases workload and stress for remaining employees, often resulting in exhaustion and burnout, consistent with findings by Kim and Fernandez (2021). A mean score of 4.04 underscores the consensus that turnover leads to a loss of institutional knowledge and expertise, negatively affecting organizational performance and necessitating increased training costs, echoing the research of Hancock et al. (2018). Moderate agreement (mean 3.58–3.64) was observed regarding turnover's

effects on team dynamics, morale, recruitment challenges, and project disruptions, suggesting these impacts are present but not pervasive or severe. High turnover was also associated with increased training costs and prolonged onboarding, as Weller et al. (2020) supported. Overall, with a mean score of 3.77, the findings highlight that while the most significant concerns revolve around workload, stress, and knowledge loss, other areas, such as team morale and recruitment, experience only moderate and sporadic effects, varying across organizational contexts.

Table 21. *Effects of Employee Turnover in Terms of Personnel*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. The turnover of employees has resulted in increased workload and stress for remaining employees.	4.16	4.03	4.10	Agree
2. Employee turnover has led to a loss of institutional knowledge and expertise.	4.28	3.81	4.04	Agree
3. The turnover of key personnel has negatively impacted team dynamics and collaboration.	3.69	3.48	3.58	Moderately Agree
4. Employee turnover has affected the morale and motivation of remaining employees.	3.49	3.41	3.45	Moderately Agree
5. The organization has faced challenges in recruiting and retaining qualified replacements for departing employees.	3.59	3.62	3.60	Moderately Agree
6. Employee turnover has disrupted ongoing projects and delayed the achievement of organizational goals.	3.73	3.56	3.64	Moderately Agree
7. The frequent turnover has increased training costs and the time required to onboard new employees.	4.00	4.02	4.01	Agree
Overall Mean	3.85	3.70	3.77	Moderately Agree

Budget

Table 22 presents the level of agreement regarding the effects of employee turnover at DSWD RO V on budget aspects.

Table 22. *Effects of Employee Turnover in Terms of Budget*

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Employee turnover has resulted in increased recruitment and training costs.	3.84	3.75	3.80	Moderately Agree
2. The organization has accrued costs associated with severance packages or compensation for departing employees (payment of terminal leave credits, and other benefits).	3.39	3.64	3.52	Moderately Agree
3. High turnover impacts the budget allocation for new hires and onboarding processes.	3.60	3.67	3.64	Moderately Agree
4. Employee turnover leads to loss of productivity and efficiency, affecting budget performance.	3.67	3.53	3.60	Moderately Agree
5. Budget constraints resulting from turnover have affected the implementation of strategic initiatives or projects.	3.73	3.60	3.66	Moderately Agree
6. Employee turnover has increased overtime expenses for remaining staff due to understaffing.	4.02	3.98	4.00	Agree
7. The financial impact of turnover has necessitated budget reallocations from other critical areas to cover turnover-related costs.	3.71	3.60	3.65	Moderately Agree
Overall Mean	3.71	3.68	3.70	Moderately Agree

The overall mean score of 3.70 reflects a moderate agreement among all respondents that employee turnover creates a financial burden for the organization. This implies that respondents do not hold strong views on the established effects of turnover on organizational finances, as it is not consistently experienced, and the organization has managed it effectively to mitigate its impact. Respondents may not have an extensive opinion on the broader financial repercussions of turnover due to infrequent experiences with significant turnover events and the organization's effective strategies to handle these challenges. This analysis highlights an opportunity for the

organization to inform staff about the implications of turnover further and strengthen strategies to reduce its financial impact, ensuring better alignment between management and employee perceptions.

Policy

Table 23 presents the level of agreement regarding the effects of employee turnover on the organizational policies of DSWD RO V. The overall mean score of 3.66 concerning organizational policy suggests that respondents perceive the effects of employee turnover on policies as somewhat evident, although not consistently present. This implies that the challenges related to turnover's impact on organizational policies must be addressed promptly to reduce any further significant effects. This aligns with existing literature, which emphasizes that employee turnover can ripple effect on organizational effectiveness, particularly in public sector institutions (Alvarez & Wiggins, 2018; Klein et al., 2020). Effective policy communication and adherence are critical in fostering a cohesive work environment. Furthermore, the need for continual policy assessment and improvement, especially in retention strategies, echoes findings from recent studies, highlighting that organizations must evolve to address the challenges posed by employee turnover (Bhatnagar et al., 2019).

Table 23. Effects of Employee Turnover in Terms of Policy

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Turnover has necessitated revisions or updates to organizational policies and procedures.	3.45	3.52	3.48	Moderately Agree
2. Employee turnover may lead to inconsistencies in policy implementation and enforcement.	3.47	3.45	3.46	Moderately Agree
3. Turnover has highlighted areas where existing policies may need improvement to address retention issues.	3.69	3.68	3.68	Moderately Agree
4. Due to turnover, The organization has faced challenges maintaining consistency and continuity in policies.	3.47	3.60	3.54	Moderately Agree
5. High turnover affects the effectiveness of policy communication and adherence among employees.	3.75	3.65	3.70	Moderately Agree
6. Frequent turnover has led to gaps in policy knowledge among new employees, requiring additional training and clarification.	4.08	3.98	4.03	Agree
7. Employee turnover has exposed weaknesses in existing retention and succession planning policies.	3.90	3.59	3.74	Moderately Agree
Overall Mean	3.69	3.64	3.66	Moderately Agree

Programs

Table 24 presents the level of agreement regarding the effects of employee turnover on the organizational programs of DSWD RO V.

Table 24. Effects of Employee Turnover in Terms of Programs

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Employee turnover disrupts the continuity and progress of ongoing programs and initiatives.	4.02	3.69	3.86	Moderately Agree
2. High turnover hinders the successful implementation of new programs and projects.	3.96	3.74	3.85	Moderately Agree
3. Turnover has impacted the effectiveness of employee engagement or wellness programs.	3.69	3.62	3.66	Moderately Agree
4. The organization has faced challenges sustaining long-term projects or programs due to turnover.	3.59	3.56	3.58	Moderately Agree
5. Employee turnover has hindered the achievement of organizational goals or milestones.	3.57	3.54	3.56	Moderately Agree
6. Turnover has disrupted mentorship and training programs, reducing their effectiveness.	3.57	3.50	3.54	Moderately Agree
7. Frequent turnover has caused program evaluations and reporting delays, affecting decision-making processes.	3.80	3.74	3.77	Moderately Agree
Overall Mean	3.74	3.63	3.69	Moderately Agree

The responses reveal that both management and rank-and-file employees at DSWD RO V "moderately agree" with the statements regarding the effects of employee turnover on various programs, reflecting uncertainty or ambivalence rather than a strong consensus. The overall mean score of 3.69 indicates that turnover is perceived to have a noticeable effect on organizational programs, though this impact is not uniformly felt across all areas. Respondents strongly agree that employee turnover disrupts the continuity and progress of ongoing programs and initiatives. It also hampers the successful implementation of new programs and projects. Additionally, turnover has affected the effectiveness of employee engagement or wellness programs. Respondents also acknowledged challenges in sustaining long-term projects or programs, hindering the achievement of organizational goals or milestones. Turnover has also disrupted mentorship and training programs, diminishing their effectiveness. Moreover, frequent turnover has caused program evaluations and reporting delays, impacting decision-making processes. These responses indicate that while the majority does not always experience these effects, turnover sometimes impedes the overall implementation of programs and services. These findings align with existing literature, which suggests that high turnover rates can significantly affect program stability and effectiveness, particularly in public sector organizations (Klein et al., 2020; Bhatnagar et al., 2019).

Organizational Performance

Table 25 presents the level of agreement regarding the effects of employee turnover on DSWD RO V's organizational performance.

Table 25. Effects of Employee Turnover in Terms of Organizational Performance

Indicators	Management Team & Heads	Rank-and-File Employees	Overall	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Interpretation
1. Turnover has affected the overall productivity and efficiency of the organization.	3.84	3.69	3.76	Moderately Agree
2. The departure of key personnel has negatively impacted the quality of work or service delivery.	3.76	3.64	3.70	Moderately Agree
3. Employee turnover has influenced stakeholder perceptions of the organization's stability and reliability.	3.59	3.52	3.55	Moderately Agree
4. The organization has experienced declines in customer satisfaction or client outcomes due to turnover.	3.45	3.33	3.39	Moderately Agree
5. Turnover-related disruptions have hindered progress towards strategic objectives or targets.	3.49	3.49	3.49	Moderately Agree
6. High turnover has led to increased errors or rework, affecting the organization's performance metrics.	3.71	3.65	3.68	Moderately Agree
7. Employee turnover has strained leadership capacity, impacting strategic decision-making and organizational direction.	3.57	3.54	3.55	Moderately Agree
Overall Mean	3.63	3.55	3.59	Moderately Agree

The overall mean score of 3.59, or "moderately agree," regarding the effects of employee turnover on organizational performance indicates that both management and rank-and-file employees at DSWD RO V perceive turnover as having a noticeable, though not significant, impact on performance. Respondents generally appear uncertain or neutral, suggesting that the effects of turnover on performance are not consistently felt but are experienced occasionally.

3.4 Necessary Fundamental Components of an Employee Sustainable Intervention Program

Table 26 displays the suggestions and recommendations from the management teams and rank-and-file employees regarding the key components of a sustainable employee intervention program. These recommendations, derived from responses to the interview guide, highlight critical elements that DSWD RO V should prioritize to address frequent turnover and its underlying causes effectively.

Table 26. *Necessary Fundamental Components of an Employee Sustainable Intervention Program*

Themes	Description
Work-Life Balance and Wellbeing	Emphasis on promoting work-life balance, wellness programs, flexible working hours, and minimizing weekend/holiday work to ensure employee well-being.
Workload Management	Better distribution and management of employee workload and caseload to reduce burnout and ensure manageable responsibilities across different roles and teams.
Job Security and Stability	To reduce turnover and increase retention, focus on providing more plantilla positions and ensuring job security, particularly for COS workers.
Training and Skills Development	Continued training is aligned with job roles, opportunities for skill development, coaching, and mentoring to address skills gaps and support professional growth, enhancing retention.
Promotion and Career Development	Highlighting the need for structured career paths, fair promotion opportunities, and professional development programs.
Rewards and Recognition	Emphasizing the importance of recognizing employee contributions through rewards, recognition programs, diversified appreciation activities, or monetary/non-monetary incentives.
Positive Organizational Culture	Emphasis on fostering a supportive and transparent work environment that aligns with organizational values and supports employee engagement and job satisfaction.
Effective Leadership and Management	To foster a positive work environment, better leadership training, management skills, transparency, trust-building among supervisors, and strong management support are needed.
Employee Engagement and Participation	Involving employees in decision-making processes, gathering feedback (e.g., exit interviews, regular check-ins), and fostering a participatory work culture.
Conducive Work Environment	Improving the physical workplace, equipment availability, office space, and support for field workers, especially in remote or island areas.
Proper Resource Allocation	Emphasizes the need for adequate resources and timely processing of reimbursements and allowances.
Fair Compensation Structure	Stresses the need for competitive pay and benefits to attract and retain employees.
Competency-Based Hiring	Focus on transparent and merit-based hiring and promotion processes to build trust and eliminate favoritism, ensuring equity in the workplace.

4.0 Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the current HRM practices at DSWD RO V do not significantly affect employee retention, satisfaction, productivity, or organizational efficiency. However, key factors influencing employee turnover include unmet needs and an imbalanced employer-employee relationship, which must be addressed to improve retention. The lack of professional growth opportunities has also contributed to former employees leaving the organization. Adequate human capital remains crucial for the effective functioning of the DSWD RO V. In response, the study recommends a comprehensive, inclusive employee intervention program that addresses the needs of all employees, including targeted interventions for COS workers. Future research could explore the effectiveness of such programs and investigate how different HRM practices might impact employee outcomes in similar organizations.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The author declares this paper as an original work, incorporating previously published material that has been properly cited. The author contributed to the study's design, data analysis, and interpretation, ensuring all external sources were appropriately acknowledged.

6.0 Funding

This work received no specific grant from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflicts of interest about the publication of this paper.

8.0 Acknowledgment

I am deeply grateful to God for His guidance and strength throughout this journey. My heartfelt thanks go to my adviser, Dr. Harley G. Peralta, and my dissertation committee, particularly Dr. Rosy Azupardo-Cantara, Dr. Elenita L. Tan, Dr. Ma. Christine R. Boduan, Dr. Michelle Maddela, and Dr. Maria Shane S. Del Rosario, for their invaluable support and feedback. I also appreciate Dr. Sylvia Elena B. Payonga, Mr. Rey B. Bongon, and the respondents from DSWD Regional Office V for their contributions. My deepest gratitude goes to my family, especially my husband, for their unwavering support, love, and encouragement throughout this endeavor. I am profoundly thankful for their presence in my life and for being my source of strength.

9.0 References

- Afonso, P., Lazaro, J., & Oliveira, M. (2020). Contract workers in government settings: Career development pathways and employee intentions to leave. *Public Administration Review*, 80(2), 256-268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13123>
- Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2019). Benefits of training and development: The role of recognition and rewards. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2018.63>
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2022). The role of leave in employee recovery and well-being. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37(3), 565-578. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-021-09851-0>

- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2018). The dynamic component model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 75-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2018.11.002>
- Baker, T. L., & Murphy, J. (2019). Financial incentives and timely reimbursements: Impact on employee morale and loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 102, 325-332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.09.045>
- Bedi, R., Alpaslan, A. H., & Green, S. (2018). Perceived ethical leadership and employee outcomes: The mediating role of trust in the leader. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3236-1>
- Birou, L. S., Kearney, S. W., & Lee, J. (2019). The importance of targeted training programs in closing skills gaps. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 30(4), 431-450. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21332>
- Blanchflower, D. G., & Bryson, A. (2022). The impact of pension plans on employee retention in the public sector. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 40(2), 275-302. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714089>
- Breaugh, J., Ritz, A., & Alfes, K. (2018). Work motivation and public service motivation: Disentangling varieties of motivation and job satisfaction. *Public Management*
- Brun, J.P., & Dugas, N. (2018). An analysis of employee recognition: How it impacts job satisfaction and motivation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(5), 1037-1057. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1221118>
- Carter, S. M., Jones, L. T., & Lee, J. K. (2021). Connecting tasks to organizational goals: Enhancing employee motivation and commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(3), 654-670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1574232>
- Casper, W. J., Vaziri, H., Wayne, J. H., & Matthews, R. A. (2020). A review of work-life balance: A new perspective on employee well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(8), 917-935. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000443>
- Chatterjee, S., Bhattacharya, S., & Sharma, A. (2019). Factors affecting employees' willingness to stay with an organization: The impact of workplace accessibility and commute length. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7(3), 27-36. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jhrm.20190703.11>
- Cruz, L., & Ramirez, J. (2020). Sustainable HR practices for employee retention in government agencies. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 64(2), 150-172.
- De Korte, K. A., & Frijters, P. (2020). The physical work environment: Its impact on employee well-being and productivity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(1), 25-40. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000142>
- Eisenberger, R., Malone, G. P., & Presson, W. D. (2019). Optimizing perceived organizational support to enhance employee engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), 491-502. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2350>
- Gallup. (2022). Employee engagement and retention: The crucial role of feeling valued. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/engagementreport>
- Ghani, B., Memon, K., Ullah, R., & Zada, M. (2022). Challenges and strategies for employee retention in the hospitality industry: A review. *MDPI*, 14(5), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052885>
- Ghani, M. (2022). Understanding the dynamics of workplace satisfaction: A management perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(1), 1-20.
- Green, F. (2018). Job insecurity, turnover and the demand for flexible labor in organizations. *Journal of Labor Market Research*, 50(1), 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12651-018-0243-6>
- Grote, G. (2020). The significance of timely and constructive feedback for employee satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(2), 189-205. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000461>
- Handayani, P.F., & Joeliaty, J. (2023). The role of work-life balance, workplace discomfort behavior, psychological well-being and employee assistance program on job satisfaction. *E-Jurnal Apresiasi Ekonomi*, 11(2), 412-421. <https://doi.org/10.31846/jae.v11i2.660>
- Hur, H., & Hawley, J. (2020). Turnover behavior among US government employees. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 86(4), 641-642. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0020852318823913>
- Ishtiaq, M. (2019). Book review: Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, SA: Sage. Canadian Center of Science and Education, 12(5), 40-41. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ELT.V12N5P40>
- Kumar, S., & Singh, A. (2020). The significance of a clear vision for organizational success: Implications for employee retention. *Organizational Dynamics*, 49(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2019.100719>
- Kuvaas, B., Dysvik, A., & Buch, R. (2019). Non-monetary rewards, work motivation, and employee turnover: A psychological perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(3), 412-425. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2348>
- Lee, J., & Hwang, J. (2020). The role of alignment between individual roles and organizational objectives in job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(4), 315-329. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2442>
- Li, J., Chen, Y., & Liu, Z. (2020). Growth opportunities and job satisfaction: How they influence employee retention. *Personnel Psychology*, 73(1), 101-121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12366>
- Liu, Y., Wang, M., & Li, X. (2020). Perceived unfairness in promotion practices and its impact on employee satisfaction and turnover intentions: A moderated mediation model. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(3), 342-359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12268>
- Luna-Arocas, R., & Morley, M. J. (2020). Career stagnation: The impact of hierarchical structures on turnover intentions. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(2), 195-208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12269>
- Maslach, C. (2021). Work overload and burnout in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 81(2), 299-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13343>
- Masuda, A. D., Hama, Y., & Hozumi, T. (2018). The role of family support systems in employee retention: Insights from a study of workplace dynamics. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(16), 2345-2365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1478401>
- McCarthy, M. J., O'Neill, J., & Whelan, S. (2020). The role of recognition in employee engagement: A study on the effects of personalized recognition. *Employee Relations*, 42(5), 1000-1015. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-06-2019-0307>
- Medaris, J. (2023). Access to career development programs: A management perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 33(1), 47-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12329>
- Men, L. R., & Yue, Z. (2019). The impact of leadership communication on employee satisfaction and turnover. *Journal of Communication Management*, 23(4), 321-335. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-09-2018-0091>
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Van Dick, R. (2021). The impact of a strong sense of belonging on employee retention and job satisfaction: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(7), 980-999. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2505>
- Millan, J. M., Nussbaum, A. D., & Kubiak, T. (2020). Competitive salaries and their impact on employee satisfaction and retention. *Human Resource Management*, 59(4), 333-346. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22013>
- Mullen, J., & Kahn, W. (2018). Coaching and mentorship in fostering employee engagement: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 12(1), 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.24384/000466>
- Nitafan, R. (2020). Employee silence, organizational commitment, and job burnout of regular employees in local government units in the Cotabato province, Philippines: A keystone for intervention. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 5(6), 1932-1948. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.56.20>
- Ng, T., Yim, F., Chen, H., & Zou, Y. (2022). Employer-sponsored career development practices and employee performance and turn-over: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 50(2), <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221125143>
- Nguyen, D., & McGuire, S. (2021). The role of sufficient resources in employee performance: A public sector perspective. *International Public Management Journal*, 24(3), 384-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2020.1815612>
- Ozdemir, I. (2024). Employee development and turnover intention: A meta-analytical review. *Open Peer Review on Qeios*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.32388/PQVBRW>
- Park, H., & Wang, L. (2019). The role of peer recognition in enhancing employee morale and engagement. *Psychological Reports*, 123(3), 943-961. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294118823246>
- Rana, N. P., & Sharma, R. (2022). The role of personalized recognition in enhancing employee engagement and reducing turnover. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(5), 847-867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1828049>
- Ramamoorthy, S. (2022). Towards a new paradigm. *NHRD Network Journal*, 15 (3), 307-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/26314541221088045>
- Reddy, M. C., Prasad, K. S., & Gupta, A. (2020). The role of adequate resources in employee retention: Insights from the service industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 265-275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.029>
- Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2021). What do we know about employee engagement? A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(1), 32-57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2491>
- Schoeman, D., & Pienaar, J. (2023). Resource limitations in public administration: Effects on employee performance and satisfaction. *Public Administration Review*, 83(1), 120-132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13428>
- Scussiato, L. A., Peres, A. M., Tomimaga, L. B. L., & de Lima, K. D. C. (2019). Factors causing dissatisfaction among nurses in the private hospital context. *Revista Mineira de Enfermagem (REME)*, 23, e-1222. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/reader/a87d4423f37c9beb8978e11c684e13aa721073da>
- Sharma, V. (2020). Conceptual framework of employee and organization related variables: A review and synthesis of literature. *Ramanujan International Journal of Business and Research*, 189-201. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355171129>
- Singh, D. (2019). A literature review on employee retention with focus on recent trends. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology*, 6(1), 425-431. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331306592>
- Smith, T., & Lewis, L. (2020). Aligning job roles with individual skills: Implications for employee fulfillment and productivity. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 35(4), 549-562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-019-09657-y>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2021). Recovery from job stress: The role of time and space in the effectiveness of stress management programs. *Stress and Health*, 37(2), 293-302. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2934>

- Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(4), 429-442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417>
- Wall, J. A., & Dunne, T. C. (2022). The impact of conflict resolution practices on employee retention: A study of workplace dynamics. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 66(4), 456-478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220027211026128>
- Williams, J. R., Housman, M., & Allen, J. (2019). Connecting recognition to organizational outcomes: Clarifying employee roles in achieving success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), 453-467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2351>
- Zatzick, C. D., & Iverson, R. D. (2019). Job insecurity and employee engagement: The mediating role of workplace safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 24(1), 103-114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000081>
- Zhenjing, L., Wang, Y., & Chen, F. (2022). The impact of a conducive work environment on employee satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37(3), 627-643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-021-09701-0>
- Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. (2020). Perceived unfairness and its impact on employee morale and turnover intentions: A cross-sectional study. *Employee Relations*, 42(4), 803-817. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-06-2019-0222>