

Effects of Leadership Style, Work Environment, and Organizational Motivation on Employee Performance Moderated by Job Satisfaction: A Case of Local Government Unit of San Pascual, Batangas

Sunshine A. Grantoza

Batangas State University, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000474>

Received: 14 June 2025; Accepted: 18 June 2025; Published: 24 July 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines how leadership style, work environment, and organizational motivation impact employee performance at the Local Government Unit of San Pascual, Batangas, with job satisfaction as a moderating factor. The researcher used a quantitative descriptive approach. Data was gathered from 147 randomly selected employees through a researcher-made questionnaire on a 4-point Likert scale. Statistical tools such as weighted mean, percentage and frequency were used for respondent's profile and ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, t-tests, Mann-Whitney U test and medmod in jamovi software were used for moderation analysis.

Findings showed most respondents were aged 25–34, female, married, in rank-and-file roles, with 0–2 years of service, and earned Php 10,957–Php 21,914 monthly. In terms of employee performance, it summarizes that employees in municipality are performing well based on their own perspective on how they execute the job according to the municipality's needs and expectations. Employees are satisfied enough on the overall leadership style, work environment and organizational motivation in the municipality. In terms of job satisfaction, it resulted that employees are satisfied. It reveals that there is no significant difference between employee performance and to age, civil status, position, and years of service. There is a significant difference between employee performance and sex and monthly salary. Employee job satisfaction can moderately influence leadership style and organizational motivation but has nothing to do with work environment. As per the result of the assessment on leadership style, work environment and organizational motivation, the researcher suggests focusing on sustaining strengths, leveraging existing satisfaction, and strategically enhancing long-term organizational performance.

Keywords: leadership style, work environment, organizational motivation, employee performance, job satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the local government of San Pascual has faced several controversies involving its leadership. In December 2024, allegations were raised against the vice mayor for misusing public resources, including the selective distribution of government aid and the improper use of government vehicles and facilities for personal political campaigns. These actions led to accusations of corruption and violations of election laws (Daily Tribune, 2024). Further controversies include an incident in late 2018 when a local official took an unauthorized trip to the United States. In March 2019, administrative charges were filed against the mayor for not securing proper approvals for the trip, which sparked political tension and allegations of political motivation behind the complaints (GMA News, 2019). Additionally, in 2019, the failure to pass the municipal budget led to graft charges against the vice mayor and several councilors, impacting essential public services (Manila Standard, 2019). Other past disputes include an investigation in November 2020 involving a previous vice mayor over his involvement in a non-governmental event, leading to scrutiny from the Civil Service Commission and the Department of the Interior and Local Government (Manila Times, 2020). In March 2019,

accusations of corruption related to budget delays also added to the strain on local governance, further illustrating the political instability affecting the local government (Manila Standard, 2019).

These incidents highlight ongoing political tensions and governance challenges within San Pascual's local government. Such political instability not only threatens the leadership's credibility but also permeates the work environment, potentially affecting employee performance. Employees may feel insecure or disillusioned if the leadership is unstable or divided. A lack of direction, trust, and transparency from leadership can result in poor communication and low morale among staff. A highly politicized and contentious work environment can create tension and division among employees, particularly if there are factions loyal to either the mayor or vice mayor. These tensions can spill over into daily work activities, leading to a lack of collaboration, distrust, and potentially hostile interactions. Organizational motivation can also decline if employees witness favoritism or unethical practices, as they may feel their hard work is not valued or rewarded fairly.

In an environment where political issues are pervasive, job satisfaction tends to decrease. Employees who feel unsupported, undervalued, or disconnected from leadership will likely see their job satisfaction plummet. Lower job satisfaction leads to disengagement, lack of motivation, and even burnout. Employees who feel their leadership is unstable or embroiled in conflict are less likely to give their best effort in their work, resulting in lower overall performance. Conversely, employees who are satisfied with their work environment, feel secure in their leadership, and have clear goals are more likely to perform well, stay committed, and contribute to the organization's success.

The political and leadership issues in San Pascual likely have negative repercussions for the local government's work environment. These issues can undermine leadership effectiveness, erode trust, reduce job satisfaction, and hinder employee performance. A more stable, transparent, and collaborative leadership approach would be necessary to restore employee morale and performance, ultimately fostering a healthier organizational culture.

This study, therefore, seeks to assess the moderating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between leadership style, work environment, and organizational motivation on employee performance within the Local Government Unit of San Pascual, Batangas. While much of the existing literature on public administration explores leadership and employee performance in stable settings, fewer studies examine how political instability specifically influences these dynamics in local government contexts. By addressing this gap, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how governance challenges shape organizational outcomes, offering practical insights for improving employee well-being and institutional effectiveness in politically volatile environments.

Objectives

This study aims to assess the moderating impact of job satisfaction on the leadership style, work environment, and organizational motivation on employee performance in the Local Government Unit of San Pascual, Batangas.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 Age;

1.2 Sex;

1.3 Civil Status;

1.4 Position;

1.5 Years of Service and;

1.6 Monthly Salary?

2. How may the Employee Performance in the Local Government Unit of San Pascual be assessed with regards to:

2.1 Quality;

2.2 Quantity;

2.3 Effectiveness;

2.4 Final Result and;

2.5 Development Opportunities?

3. How may the Leadership Style in the Local Government Unit of San Pascual be described in terms of:

3.1 Participative Leadership;

3.2 Directive Leadership;

3.3 Supportive Leadership and;

3.4 Achievement- Oriented Leadership?

4. How may the Work Environment in Local Government Unit of San Pascual be assessed with regards to:

4.1 Work Atmosphere;

4.2 Relationships between co- workers and;

4.3 Availability of Work Facilities?

5. How may the Organizational Motivation in the Local Government Unit of San Pascual be assessed with regards to:

5.1 Need for Achievement;

5.2 Need for Power and;

5.3 Need for Affiliation?

6. What is the level of employee's job satisfaction with regards to:

6.1 Work itself;

6.2 Salary;

6.3 Job Promotion;

6.4 Supervision and;

6.5 Co-workers?

7. Is there a significant difference in the assessment towards employee performance when respondents are grouped according to profile?

8. Does the assessment relative to job satisfaction significantly moderate the effects of leadership style, work environment, and organizational motivation towards employee performance?
9. What proposed strategic recommendations may be developed based on the findings?

Hypothesis of the Study

Based on the theoretical framework adapted in the study of Sulastiningtiyas D., Nilasari, B.M. (2018), the following hypotheses are developed:

H1: There is no significant relationship between employee performance and profile of respondents.

H2: There is no significant relationship between employee performance and leadership style.

H3: There is no significant relationship between employee performance and work environment.

H4: There is no significant relationship between employee performance and organizational motivation.

H5: Job Satisfaction does not moderately effect on Leadership Style.

H6: Job Satisfaction does not moderately effect on Work Environment.

H7: Job Satisfaction does not moderately effect on Organizational Motivation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The data collection instrument used in the study was a researcher-made questionnaire, developed by integrating relevant research related to the variables and sub-variables in the study. The questionnaire was validated by the research adviser and pilot-tested in the Local Government Unit of Bauan, Batangas, which shares a similar organizational structure. The pilot test involved 25 employees and was conducted two weeks before the actual survey. The reliability test showed excellent Cronbach's alpha values: 0.92 for employee performance, 0.95 for leadership style, 0.73 for work environment (acceptable), 0.92 for organizational motivation, and 0.94 for job satisfaction, with an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.97, indicating excellent internal consistency. The questionnaire consisted of six parts: demographic profile and assessments on employee performance, leadership style, work environment, organizational motivation, and job satisfaction, with five statements for each variable. A 4-point Likert scale was used for responses.

The data gathering process began with the researcher visiting concerned departments and offices, preparing a letter to be reviewed by the research adviser and approved by relevant authorities, such as the Human Resource Department and the Mayor's office. The study involved 147 employees from the municipality of San Pascual, Batangas, selected using random sampling. The researcher administered the survey face-to-face, one-on-one with each office, as it was more time-efficient than an online survey. Ethical considerations were prioritized, and all respondents were informed about the study's purpose, confidentiality, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw at any time. The data collection process was completed within two consecutive weeks.

For data analysis, the statistical software Jamovi was used. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency and percentage, were employed to analyze the respondents' demographic profiles. Weighted mean, standard deviation, and frequency were used to interpret the assessments of employee performance, leadership style, work environment, organizational motivation, and job satisfaction. Inferential statistics, including one-way ANOVA, independent samples t-test, and Kruskal-Wallis test, were used to analyze differences between groups. Multiple linear regression with medmod analysis was employed to test the differences with moderating variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Distribution of Respondent's Profile

Age

As a result, the findings revealed that the age bracket of 25-34 years old had the highest frequency, with 48 out of 147 respondents (32.7%). In contrast, 65 and above had the lowest frequency of 0, followed by 15-24 age group, with only 13 respondents (8.8%).

Age	Frequency	Percent
15-24	13	8.8
25-34	48	32.7
35-44	29	19.7
45-54	30	20.4
55-64	27	18.4
65 and above	0	0
Total	147	100

Given that the majority of respondents were in the 25-34 age range, it can be presumed that most are young professionals, newly employed, or first-time job seekers. This aligns with the study by Tadeja et al. (2024), which found that most government employees in the National Capital Region are young professionals, often occupying entry-level or intermediate positions. While age has been linked to a potential decline in cognitive capacity, research suggests that this does not necessarily correlate with lower performance. Factors such as the continued practice and application of specific skills can help mitigate any age-related decline in performance (Viviani, A.C., 2021).

This data challenges the assumption that younger employees in LGU San Pascual may not perform as well as those with more years of service. In fact, experience in various roles and organizations may contribute significantly to improving knowledge and job performance. The 65 and above age group may represent 0 employed in the municipality. This implies that in this age group commonly senior citizens are mostly retired, pensioner, or maybe focusing on family or into business. The 15-24 age group typically represents a smaller portion of the overall government employee population, as many individuals in this range are still pursuing education, apprenticeships, or other training programs, leading them to focus more on developmental activities than on immediate government employment (Hayes, A., 2025).

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	67	45.6
Female	80	54.4
Total	147	100

Sex

As for the sex, most of the respondents were female with a frequency of 80 with an equivalent percentage of 54.4 while male respondents gathered a frequency of 67 with 45.6%. It was observed that the higher number of female employees may reflect broader trends in job preferences, where women are often more represented in office or administrative roles, while men may be more represented in skilled or labor-intensive fields. However, it's important to recognize that individual choices and career paths can vary widely regardless of gender.

Previous studies have highlighted the performance of female employees in office-based roles. For instance, Darmi & Agussalim (2017) found that 84.4% of female respondents reported excellent performance in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities, which aligns with the trend observed in LGU San Pascual.

Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	53	36.1
Married	86	58.5
Separated	1	0.7
Widowed	7	4.8
Total	147	100

Provided this result, the majority of the respondents are married with frequency of 86 with equivalent of 58.5%, followed by single with frequency of 53 which is equivalent to 36.1%. Separated and widowed are also present but had the least frequency compared to married and single. While the results of this study show that it is important to note that while family responsibilities may contribute to loyalty and stability for some married employees, individual motivations and work performance are influenced by a wide range of factors, including personal values, career goals, and organizational support and work, De Leon C.M. et al. (2022) found that these same responsibilities could also motivate greater loyalty to the organization, as married employees may value job stability more than their single counterparts.

Position

Position	Frequency	Percent
Rank and File	132	89.8
Middle Management	15	10.2
Total	147	100

In terms of position, the result shows that there are 132 respondents who are in the rank and file or still in the lower rank position with 89.8%, while the middle management position only has 15 respondents with 10.2%. The majority of employees in LGU San Pascual occupy lower-level positions, which aligns with the fact that most of the respondents are in the 25-34 age bracket, an age range typically associated with employees in the early stages of their careers. This suggests that many employees are in the process of adapting to their workload, as they are in intermediate-level positions and may have less experience compared to those in middle management roles. It disagreed with the result of the study of De Leon C.M (2022), where the majority of the participants were permanent and since most of the respondents served for quite long time, they usually become permanent and may perform well.

Years of Service

Regarding the years of service, the results indicate a significant variation in the length of service among the respondents. The majority, comprising 41 individuals (27.9%), have relatively short tenures, ranging from 0-2 years of service. This suggests that a substantial portion of the workforce in the Local Government Unit (LGU) of San Pascual consists of newer employees, likely in entry-level positions or those just beginning their careers in local government. These employees, typically less experienced, may still be undergoing training and familiarizing themselves with the organizational culture and structure, which could influence their job performance, adaptability, and overall job satisfaction.

Years of Service	Frequency	Percent (%)
0–2	41	27.9
3–5	32	21.8
6–9	25	17.0
10–12	9	6.1
13–15	3	2.0
16–18	4	2.7
19–21	3	2.0
22 and above	30	20.4
Total	147	100.0

In contrast, a notable portion of the respondents—30 individuals (20.4%)—have extensive experience, with 22 or more years of service. Despite their long tenure, these employees are still in lower-ranked positions within the organization. This discrepancy between years of service and position level may reflect several underlying organizational issues, such as lack of promotion opportunities, stagnant career growth, or the absence of clear pathways for upward mobility. Long-tenured employees who remain in low-ranking positions may feel overlooked or underappreciated, potentially leading to decreased motivation and job satisfaction. The feeling of stagnation could contribute to lower performance levels, as employees may feel that their experience and dedication to the organization are not being properly recognized or rewarded.

This disparity between years of service and position level warrants attention from organizational leaders and human resource managers. When long-serving employees remain in lower positions, they may experience a sense of unfulfillment, despite their accumulated expertise.

Monthly Salary

Monthly Salary Range (PHP)	Frequency	Percent (%)
10,957 – 21,914	121	82.3
21,915 – 43,828	17	11.6
43,829 – 76,669	1	0.7
76,670 – 131,484	8	5.4
Total	147	100.0

The findings on the monthly salary of respondents reveal that the majority of employees (82.3%) earn between Php 10,957 and Php 21,914, which is classified as a semi-poor level of family income. This salary range is often insufficient to meet the needs of the average family, particularly for those with dependents or higher living expenses. Given this financial constraint, employees in this salary bracket may experience stress or dissatisfaction, which could impact their work performance and overall motivation. The insufficient income may also lead to financial instability, potentially contributing to increased turnover, as employees may seek better-paying job opportunities that offer greater financial security.

The observation that employees in this income range may be more inclined to leave their current jobs or perform below their potential is supported by the idea that low pay often correlates with lower job satisfaction and motivation. Employees who feel that their compensation does not adequately reflect their contributions may become disengaged, which in turn could hinder their performance and productivity.

This finding aligns with the study of Patel & Pillai (2022), which underscores the importance of

compensation in motivating employees, boosting morale, and encouraging employees to set higher goals. When employees feel fairly compensated, they are more likely to stay committed to the organization, work harder, and strive for professional growth. On the contrary, when compensation is insufficient, it can lead to job dissatisfaction and a lack of enthusiasm for the work, which may prompt employees to seek alternative employment opportunities.

Similarly, the study by Sumerli et al. (2022) highlights the significant relationship between compensation, competence, and employee performance. When employees are fairly compensated for their skills and contributions, it not only boosts their satisfaction but also enhances their performance. Conversely, inadequate compensation can lead to feelings of undervaluation, which can negatively affect both job satisfaction and overall performance. Therefore, the data on salary in the LGU of San Pascual suggests that improving compensation levels could be a key factor in enhancing employee performance, satisfaction, and retention.

In summary, the findings regarding salary levels provide important insights into the financial challenges faced by employees and their potential impact on job satisfaction and performance. To improve employee engagement and retention, it may be necessary for the LGU to consider revising salary structures or providing additional financial benefits to ensure that employees feel valued and adequately compensated for their work. By addressing compensation concerns, the organization can foster a more motivated, productive, and loyal workforce.

Assessment on the Employee Performance

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Quality	147	3.41	0.424	Very Good
Quantity	147	3.28	0.428	Very Good
Effectiveness	147	3.50	0.483	Excellent
Final Result	147	3.37	0.416	Very Good
Development Opportunities	147	3.36	0.531	Very Good
Employee Performance	147	3.39	0.368	Very Good

This table shows that effectiveness of employee performance has the highest weighted mean of 3.50 with standard deviation of 0.483 and a verbal interpretation of excellent while the quantity got the lowest weighted mean of 3.28 equivalent to 0.428 standard deviation with verbal interpretation of very good. The overall performance has 3.39 weighted mean and 0.368 standard deviation equivalent to verbal interpretation of very good.

This resulted that the employee's performance in the municipality has a very good standing specifically on the effectivity of their work. Effectivity on the performance includes goals and strategies take them on right direction and municipality supports high ethical standards both have weighted mean of 3.52, 0.553 and 0.565 standard deviation respectively, and verbal interpretation of excellent. This means that municipality ensures high ethical standard while setting a clear, shared goals which are essential for guiding employees towards success. This can lead to employee engagement and motivation leading to improved performance and productivity. This observation also highlighted that while employees are focused on the effectiveness of the work, this also implicates lower productivity. However, this could still become positive in a way that effectiveness is more relevant than having high production but low effect.

According to the journal by WalkMe Team 2024, this highlights that while quality is more important than quantity, public or even private businesses still need their employees to be productive. This also highlights that one way to do it is to set specific goals and targets for employees to hit regularly. By doing so, businesses can ensure that their employees are working optimally and meeting the municipality's needs.

Leadership Style

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Participative Leadership	147	3.32	0.488	Very Good
Directive Leadership	147	3.28	0.473	Very Good
Supportive Leadership	147	3.35	0.486	Very Good
Achievement-Oriented Leadership	147	3.35	0.498	Very Good
Leadership Style	147	3.33	0.462	Very Good

In terms of leadership style, both supportive leadership and achievement-oriented leadership got the highest weighted mean of 3.35, with standard deviation of 0.486 and 0.498 respectively, which equivalent to a verbal interpretation of very good. Overall leadership style has 3.33 mean and 0.462 standard deviation and a verbal interpretation of very good.

The findings resulted that the leaders in the municipality are supportive and achievement-oriented leaders wherein they foster a collaborative supportive environment, and they celebrate team accomplishments and recognizes individual achievements which means that most of the employees could be more motivated and engaged if both are combined in a workforce. It also means that leaders who helps, guidance and a positive environment while focusing on setting challenging goals and encouraging continuous improvement are the leaders that employee's need.

This was supported by the study of Yan Wang (2022), that supportive leadership is essential in boosting employee's innovation drive. It also creates good communication methods and provide ways to improve work efficiency mainly through encouragement, providing work resources to employees, making appropriate demands on employees and creating the right amount of pressure.

Work Environment

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Work Atmosphere	147	3.22	0.625	Very Good
Relationship between Co-workers	147	3.36	0.491	Very Good
Availability of Work Facilities	147	3.35	0.455	Very Good
Work Environment	147	3.31	0.449	Very Good

This shows that relationship between co-workers has the highest weighted mean of 3.36 and standard deviation of 0.491 with verbal interpretation of very good, while work atmosphere has the least weighted mean of 3.22, standard deviation of 0.625 and with verbal interpretation of very good.

This indicates that employees are satisfied enough on the overall work environment in the municipality. It also indicates that employees are being satisfied with their co-workers as it resulted with the highest mean. It suggests that employees often want to be treated well and valued. It also reflects that one of the reasons why there is a high employee retention in the sector is that they value friendships, and this may lead to a motivated and much more engaged employees.

This was supported by the result of the study of Bella, K. (2023), where the finding highlights the significant impact of workplace relationships, and work satisfaction. It emphasizes the need for organizations to prioritize fostering positive relationships, promoting teamwork, and creating a supportive work environment to enhance job satisfaction and overall employee well-being.

Organizational Motivation

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Need for Achievement	147	3.32	0.48	Very Good
Need for Power	147	3.29	0.558	Very Good
Need for Affiliation	147	3.35	0.483	Very Good
Organizational Motivation	147	3.32	0.481	Very Good

The table shows that employees are satisfied in the overall organizational motivation in the municipality. It resulted that the need for affiliation has the highest weighted mean with 3.35, and a standard deviation of 0.483 which has a verbal interpretation of very good equivalent to being satisfied, while the need for power has the least weighted mean with a standard deviation of 0.558 and has a verbal interpretation of very good.

In relation with the previous results, employees mostly appreciate when they are being valued. Need for affiliation mainly includes encouragement and supportive workplace. It also means to build strong relationships rather than being empowered to take on advancements or authority within the workplace. Employees prefer valuing teamwork rather than being on top of the other. While leadership is undoubtedly important for direction and guidance, the belongingness and social interaction is also crucial for overall wellbeing, engagement and job satisfaction of the employees.

This was supported by the result of the study of Steinmann B. et. al (2016), where in a sample of 70 leader-follower dyads, result shows that whereas the need for achievement was marginally associated with follower-rated passive leadership, the need for affiliation was significantly related to ratings of the leader's concern for the needs of their followers.

Job Satisfaction

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Work itself	147	3.36	0.52	Satisfied
Salary	147	2.96	0.67	Not Satisfied
Job Promotion	147	3.21	0.56	Satisfied
Supervision	147	3.31	0.5	Satisfied
Co-workers	147	3.39	0.5	Satisfied
Job Satisfaction	147	3.25	0.45	Satisfied

In terms of job satisfaction, it resulted that employees are satisfied. Based on the findings, it implies that co-workers got the highest weighted mean with 0.5 standard deviation and a verbal interpretation of satisfied, in contrary, salary has the least weighted mean of 2.96 and a standard deviation of 0.67 with a verbal interpretation of not satisfied.

This proves that the employees in the municipality tends to become more satisfied with their co-workers rather than various factor such as work itself, job promotion, salary, and supervision. However this indicates satisfaction for the employees, it also indicates that there is a problem on the basic job salary and benefits of

the employees, which in return will affect their performance.

In many government studies, common finding is that employees are not always satisfied with the salaries they received, even if the salary is considered adequate by the government. This dissatisfaction can stem from various factors including perception of unfairness compared to other sectors, the impact of inflation, and a desire for higher compensation.

This was supported by the result of the study of Athamneh S. (2019), wherein using the weighted averages for the analysis of the data, the research established that the pay satisfaction of the employees in the public sector is relatively low and that employees are less than satisfied with the various pay aspects queried including pay level, benefits, pay raise and pay structure and administration. This has the implication that the low productivity in the public sector could be as a result of lack of staff motivation due to low pay.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Respondent's Profile

Age

			W	p	χ^2	df	p	Decision to Ho	Verbal Interpretation
QUALITY	15-24	25-34	-0.988	0.957	5.14	4	0.273	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	15-24	35-44	-0.626	0.992					
	15-24	45-54	-2.553	0.371					
	15-24	55-64	-1.631	0.778					
	25-34	35-44	0.599	0.993					
	25-34	45-54	-2.208	0.523					
	25-34	55-64	-0.708	0.987					
	35-44	45-54	-2.678	0.321					
	35-44	55-64	-1.319	0.884					
	45-54	55-64	1.255	0.902					
QUANTITY	15-24	25-34	-1.257	0.901	10.38	4	0.034	Reject	Significant
	15-24	35-44	0.196	1					
	15-24	45-54	-2.922	0.235					
	15-24	55-64	-2.731	0.301					
	25-34	35-44	1.915	0.657					
	25-34	45-54	-1.926	0.652					
	25-34	55-64	-1.676	0.76					
	35-44	45-54	-3.66	0.073					
	35-44	55-64	-3.548	0.089					
	45-54	55-64	0.429	0.998					
EFFECTIVENESS	15-24	25-34	-0.572	0.994	5.77	4	0.217	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	15-24	35-44	-0.402	0.999					
	15-24	45-54	-1.509	0.824					

	15-24	55-64	-2.281	0.489					
	25-34	35-44	0.17	1					
	25-34	45-54	-1.531	0.816					
	25-34	55-64	-2.645	0.334					
	35-44	45-54	-1.707	0.748					
	35-44	55-64	-2.716	0.306					
	45-54	55-64	-0.929	0.965					
FINAL RESULT	15-24	25-34	-1.963	0.636	5.78	4	0.216	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	15-24	35-44	-1.58	0.798					
	15-24	45-54	-3.281	0.139					
	15-24	55-64	-2.056	0.593					
	25-34	35-44	0.6821	0.989					
	25-34	45-54	-1.692	0.754					
	25-34	55-64	-0.024	1					
	35-44	45-54	-2.372	0.448					
	35-44	55-64	-0.807	0.979					
	45-54	55-64	1.2811	0.895					
DEVELOP MENT OPPORTU NITIES	15-24	25-34	-0.553	0.995	10.72	4	0.03	Reject	Significant
	15-24	35-44	-0.1	1					
	15-24	45-54	-1.147	0.927					
	15-24	55-64	-3.21	0.155					
	25-34	35-44	0.6377	0.991					
	25-34	45-54	-0.766	0.983					
	25-34	55-64	-3.605	0.08					
	35-44	45-54	-1.407	0.858					
	35-44	55-64	-4.09	0.031					
	45-54	55-64	-3.066	0.192					
OVERALL EMPLOYE E PERFORM ANCE	15-24	25-34	-1.31	0.887	8.63	4	0.071	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	15-24	35-44	-0.348	0.999					
	15-24	45-54	-2.608	0.348					
	15-24	55-64	-2.945	0.228					
	25-34	35-44	1.074	0.942					
	25-34	45-54	-1.871	0.677					
	25-34	55-64	-2.228	0.513					
	35-44	45-54	-2.846	0.26					
	35-44	55-64	-3.128	0.175					
	45-54	55-64	-0.34	0.999					

The table shows that there is no significant difference between quality, quantity, and effectiveness while development opportunities have significant difference in age. In addition, it resulted that the overall employee performance has no significant difference when grouped according to age. The table uses Kruskal Wallis test since there are more than two variation of age, but the p-value resulted to $<.05$. The computed data confirmed it with 0.071 p-value which is higher than 0.05 level of significance.

It revealed that development opportunities have an effect on age where ages 15-24 resulted as the majority in the previous results. It implies that younger individuals are often seen as more adaptable and capable of learning new skills quickly. It will also bring new employees to new ideas that will help them grow and achieve better performance.

In terms of overall employee performance, the table revealed that there has nothing to do with the age when it comes to employee performance. It depends solely on the existing knowledge, experience, cognitive ability, trainings or education of the employees whether the employee is younger or older. This has been contrasted with the result of the study of Igboli C. et al (2021), where the study resulted that age has significant relationship in performance.

Sex

	Group	N	Mean		Statistic	p	Decision to	Verbal Interpretation
QUALITY	MALE	67	3.5	Mann-Whitney U	2067	0.015	Reject	Significant
	FEMALE	80	3.33					
QUANTITY	MALE	67	3.33	Mann-Whitney U	2383	0.237	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	FEMALE	80	3.23					
EFFECTIVENESS	MALE	67	3.61	Mann-Whitney U	2185	0.047	Reject	Significant
	FEMALE	80	3.42					
FINAL RESULT	MALE	67	3.42	Mann-Whitney U	2377	0.227	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	FEMALE	80	3.33					
DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES	MALE	67	3.4	Mann-Whitney U	2446	0.349	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	FEMALE	80	3.33					
OVERALL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	MALE	67	3.45	Mann-Whitney U	2173	0.05	Reject	Significant
	FEMALE	80	3.33					
Note. $H_a \mu_{MALE} \neq \mu_{FEMALE}$								

The table above shows that quality and effectiveness has significantly different, while quantity, result, and development opportunities have no significant difference towards sex.

Since most respondents are female, the results showed that female employees often demonstrate high attention to detail, precision, and process adherence, contributing to higher quality and effectiveness. Female

employees may show higher performance in quality and effectiveness due to differences in work style, process orientation, communication skills, and conscientiousness, even when they produce similar amounts of work or results and receive equal development opportunities. This proves how work is approached, not just what is delivered.

In addition, the study resulted that there is a significant difference between overall employee performance and sex. It shows that there is a 0.048 p-value which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance which equivalent to significant. Mann-Whitney U test was used in this table because there are only two groups of sex mainly male and female.

While the municipality practice equality between sex or genders, there will be various work related that highlights opposite gender. It was supported by the result of the study of Zhuwao S. et al (2018), where the main findings showed that gender or sex are positively and significantly related to employee performance. It also found that since the female employees has the most frequency than male, and performs well according to previous results, it shows that with female workers exhibits higher performance in the municipality.

Civil Status

6									
			W	p	χ^2	df	p	Decision to Ho	Verbal Interpretation
QUALITY	SINGLE	MARRIED	-1.1	0.852	2.7	3	0.4	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	SINGLE	SEPARATED	1.98	0.499					
	SINGLE	WIDOWED	0	1					
	MARRIED	SEPARATED	2.05	0.47					
	MARRIED	WIDOWED	0.44	0.989					
	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	-1.6	0.67					
QUANTITY	SINGLE	MARRIED	-2.2	0.388	5.7	3	0.1	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	SINGLE	SEPARATED	2.11	0.442					
	SINGLE	WIDOWED	1.1	0.863					
	MARRIED	SEPARATED	2.22	0.397					
	MARRIED	WIDOWED	1.59	0.675					
	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	-1.6	0.67					
EFFECTIVE NESS	SINGLE	MARRIED	-0.3	0.996	1.8	3	0.6	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	SINGLE	SEPARATED	1.68	0.636					
	SINGLE	WIDOWED	-0.8	0.938					
	MARRIED	SEPARATED	1.75	0.603					

	MARRIED	WIDOWED	-0.6	0.971						
	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	-1.6	0.661						
FINAL RESULT	SINGLE	MARRIED	-1.5	0.706	3.4	3	0.3	Failed to Reject	to	Not Significant
	SINGLE	SEPARATED	1.9	0.536						
	SINGLE	WIDOWED	0.08	1						
	MARRIED	SEPARATED	2.04	0.475						
	MARRIED	WIDOWED	0.96	0.906						
	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	-1.9	0.537						
DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES	SINGLE	MARRIED	-2	0.497	4.3	3	0.2	Failed to Reject	to	Not Significant
	SINGLE	SEPARATED	1.64	0.654						
	SINGLE	WIDOWED	0.59	0.976						
	MARRIED	SEPARATED	1.96	0.511						
	MARRIED	WIDOWED	1.49	0.719						
	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	-1.4	0.775						
OVERALL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	SINGLE	MARRIED	-2	0.64	4	3	0.3	Failed to Reject	to	Not Significant
	SINGLE	SEPARATED	2.2	0.39						
	SINGLE	WIDOWED	0.3	1						
	MARRIED	SEPARATED	2.2	0.4						
	MARRIED	WIDOWED	1	0.9						
	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	-2	0.55						

This table shows that there is no significant difference between overall employee performance and civil status. It reveals that the p-value is 0.25 which is $>.05$ and indicated with no significant difference. This used Kruskal-Wallis test since it does not meet the rules for the One-way ANOVA test.

As shown in the table, each indicators have no significant difference towards civil status with all resulted having $>.05$ level of significance. It also shows that civil status has nothing to do with the employee performance, whether they are single, married or even widowed. It means that most workplaces maintain consistent performance expectations for all employees, regardless of personal life. It also indicates that marital status does not inherently affect professional skills, effort, or opportunity. Fair workplace policies and the focus on individual merit help ensure that being marries or unmarried has little to no impact in how employees perform.

This contradicts the result of the study of Memon S. (2022), showed that on the basis of all analysis it was concluded that marital status has a positively significant impact on the job performance.

Position

	Group	N	Mean		Statistic	p	Decision to Ho	Verbal Interpretation
QUALITY	RANK AND FILE	132	3.41	Mann-Whitney U	903	0.57	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	15	3.35					
QUANTITY	RANK AND FILE	132	3.3	Mann-Whitney U	781	0.17	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	15	3.15					
EFFECTIVENESS	RANK AND FILE	132	3.52	Mann-Whitney U	877	0.46	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	15	3.36					
FINAL RESULT	RANK AND FILE	132	3.39	Mann-Whitney U	713	0.07	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	15	3.2					
DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES	RANK AND FILE	132	3.39	Mann-Whitney U	711	0.07	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	15	3.09					
OVERALL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	RANK AND FILE	132	3.4	Mann-Whitney U	744	0.1	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	15	3.23					
Note. $H_a \mu_{RANK AND FILE} \neq \mu_{MIDDLE MANAGEMENT}$								

In this table, it shows that each indicator under employee performance have no significant difference towards the position. It also showed that the overall employee performance and position have no significant difference, where p-value resulted 0.115 which is $>.05$ which indicates to no significant difference. This used independent t-test specifically the Mann-Whitney U test where there are only two groups in position mainly rank and file and middle management only.

This reveals that there is no significant difference in performance based on position when organizations provide clear expectations, equal access to resources, fair evaluations, and inclusive development programs. It shows that job level does not inherently determine work quality or effectiveness—performance is driven more by individual and organizational factors.

Years of Service

			W	p	χ^2	df	p	Decision to Ho	Verbal Interpretation
QUALITY	0-2	3-5	-1.0257	0.996	5.11	7	0.65	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	0-2	6-9	-1.7586	0.919					
	0-2	10-12	-0.2728	1					
	0-2	13-15	-0.2344	1					
	0-2	16-18	-1.2065	0.99					
	0-2	19-21	-1.2399	0.988					
	0-2	22 AND ABOVE	-2.8611	0.466					
	3-5	6-9	-0.5002	1					
	3-5	10-12	0.7068	1					
	3-5	13-15	-0.0851	1					
	3-5	16-18	-0.5855	1					
	3-5	19-21	-0.9828	0.997					
	3-5	22 AND ABOVE	-1.4608	0.97					
	6-9	10-12	0.8169	0.999					
	6-9	13-15	0.3745	1					
	6-9	16-18	-0.7351	1					
	6-9	19-21	-1.0202	0.996					
	6-9	22 AND ABOVE	-1.1783	0.991					
	10-12	13-15	0	1					
	10-12	16-18	-1.2437	0.988					
	10-12	19-21	-1.3456	0.981					
	10-12	22 AND ABOVE	-1.4276	0.973					
	13-15	16-18	-0.2546	1					
	13-15	19-21	0	1					
	13-15	22 AND ABOVE	-0.59	1					
	16-18	19-21	-0.7859	0.999					
	16-18	22 AND ABOVE	0.1954	1					
	19-21	22 AND ABOVE	0.73	1					

QUANTITY	0-2	3-5	-0.152	1	12.3	7	0.09	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	0-2	6-9	-1.937	0.871					
	0-2	10-12	1.905	0.881					
	0-2	13-15	0.467	1					
	0-2	16-18	-2.352	0.711					
	0-2	19-21	-1.241	0.988					
	0-2	22 AND ABOVE	-2.889	0.453					
	3-5	6-9	-1.54	0.959					
	3-5	10-12	1.977	0.859					
	3-5	13-15	0.424	1					
	3-5	16-18	-2.186	0.783					
	3-5	19-21	-1.069	0.995					
	3-5	22 AND ABOVE	-2.512	0.637					
	6-9	10-12	3.131	0.343					
	6-9	13-15	0.987	0.997					
	6-9	16-18	-1.665	0.939					
	6-9	19-21	-0.338	1					
	6-9	22 AND ABOVE	-1.054	0.996					
	10-12	13-15	-0.94	0.998					
	10-12	16-18	-3.013	0.395					
	10-12	19-21	-2.153	0.796					
	10-12	22 AND ABOVE	-3.583	0.181					
	13-15	16-18	-1.528	0.961					
	13-15	19-21	-0.953	0.998					
	13-15	22 AND ABOVE	-1.31	0.984					
	16-18	19-21	1.103	0.994					
	16-18	22 AND ABOVE	1.205	0.99					
	19-21	22 AND ABOVE	-0.274	1					
EFFECTIVENESS	0-2	3-5	0.1317	1	11.8	7	0.11	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	0-2	6-9	-1.9742	0.86					
	0-2	10-12	-0.2448	1					
	0-2	13-15	0.1729	1					

	0-2	16-18	-0.1788	1					
	0-2	19-21	-2.1364	0.802					
	0-2	22 AND ABOVE	-3.5147	0.202					
	3-5	6-9	-2.1552	0.795					
	3-5	10-12	-0.3953	1					
	3-5	13-15	0.0868	1					
	3-5	16-18	-0.2233	1					
	3-5	19-21	-2.371	0.703					
	3-5	22 AND ABOVE	-3.6925	0.152					
	6-9	10-12	0.8589	0.999					
	6-9	13-15	1.3634	0.979					
	6-9	16-18	0.4673	1					
	6-9	19-21	-1.8142	0.906					
	6-9	22 AND ABOVE	-1.9116	0.879					
	10-12	13-15	0.5475	1					
	10-12	16-18	-0.2368	1					
	10-12	19-21	-1.6616	0.939					
	10-12	22 AND ABOVE	-1.9295	0.873					
	13-15	16-18	-0.5239	1					
	13-15	19-21	-2.1918	0.78					
	13-15	22 AND ABOVE	-2.0536	0.833					
	16-18	19-21	-1.1155	0.994					
	16-18	22 AND ABOVE	-1.1027	0.994					
	19-21	22 AND ABOVE	0.6936	1					
FINAL RESULT	0-2	3-5	-1.1487	0.993	8.88	7	0.26	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	0-2	6-9	-3.3469	0.258					
	0-2	10-12	0.4574	1					
	0-2	13-15	-0.7087	1					
	0-2	16-18	-0.376	1					
	0-2	19-21	0.742	1					
	0-2	22 AND ABOVE	-2.4513	0.666					

	3-5	6-9	-1.8484	0.897					
	3-5	10-12	1.3399	0.981					
	3-5	13-15	-0.4673	1					
	3-5	16-18	0.1454	1					
	3-5	19-21	1.3626	0.979					
	3-5	22 AND ABOVE	-1.155	0.992					
	6-9	10-12	2.8753	0.46					
	6-9	13-15	0.2255	1					
	6-9	16-18	1.3059	0.984					
	6-9	19-21	2.3695	0.704					
	6-9	22 AND ABOVE	0.6594	1					
	10-12	13-15	-0.9266	0.998					
	10-12	16-18	-0.8889	0.999					
	10-12	19-21	0.1346	1					
	10-12	22 AND ABOVE	-2.2111	0.772					
	13-15	16-18	0.5092	1					
	13-15	19-21	1.2713	0.986					
	13-15	22 AND ABOVE	0.0913	1					
	16-18	19-21	1.3098	0.984					
	16-18	22 AND ABOVE	-0.8222	0.999					
	19-21	22 AND ABOVE	-1.9681	0.862					
DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES	0-2	3-5	0.0734	1	21.5	7	0	Reject	Significant
	0-2	6-9	-2.5816	0.603					
	0-2	10-12	1.3485	0.981					
	0-2	13-15	-1.1649	0.992					
	0-2	16-18	-2.7016	0.544					
	0-2	19-21	0.3419	1					
	0-2	22 AND ABOVE	-4.4672	0.034					
	3-5	6-9	-2.7334	0.529					
	3-5	10-12	1.2797	0.986					
	3-5	13-15	-1.1634	0.992					
	3-5	16-18	-2.8006	0.495					

	3-5	19-21	0.086	1					
	3-5	22 AND ABOVE	-4.3336	0.045					
	6-9	10-12	3.0362	0.385					
	6-9	13-15	-0.7135	1					
	6-9	16-18	-2.3173	0.727					
	6-9	19-21	1.7424	0.923					
	6-9	22 AND ABOVE	-2.4777	0.653					
	10-12	13-15	-1.6883	0.934					
	10-12	16-18	-3.3158	0.269					
	10-12	19-21	-0.4204	1					
	10-12	22 AND ABOVE	-4.0776	0.076					
	13-15	16-18	0	1					
	13-15	19-21	1.2524	0.987					
	13-15	22 AND ABOVE	-0.2797	1					
	16-18	19-21	3.3101	0.272					
	16-18	22 AND ABOVE	0.328	1					
	19-21	22 AND ABOVE	-2.6313	0.579					
OVERALL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	0-2	3-5	-0.662	1	13	7	0.1	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	0-2	6-9	-2.598	0.595					
	0-2	10-12	0.591	1					
	0-2	13-15	-0.429	1					
	0-2	16-18	-1.866	0.892					
	0-2	19-21	-0.858	0.999					
	0-2	22 AND ABOVE	-3.862	0.113					
	3-5	6-9	-2.04	0.838					
	3-5	10-12	1.094	0.994					
	3-5	13-15	-0.209	1					
	3-5	16-18	-1.64	0.943					
	3-5	19-21	-0.793	0.999					
	3-5	22 AND ABOVE	-3.254	0.293					
	6-9	10-12	2.776	0.507					

	6-9	13-15	0.317	1					
	6-9	16-18	-0.541	1					
	6-9	19-21	0.106	1					
	6-9	22 AND ABOVE	-1.501	0.965					
	10-12	13-15	-0.917	0.998					
	10-12	16-18	-2.414	0.683					
	10-12	19-21	-1.574	0.954					
	10-12	22 AND ABOVE	-3.31	0.272					
	13-15	16-18	-0.5	1					
	13-15	19-21	-0.309	1					
	13-15	22 AND ABOVE	-0.755	0.999					
	16-18	19-21	0.252	1					
	16-18	22 AND ABOVE	-0.304	1					
	19-21	22 AND ABOVE	-1.021	0.996					

This table revealed that there is a significant difference in the development opportunities with p-value of 0.003 or <.05, while the table resulted that overall employee performance towards years of service has no significant difference where p-value resulted to 0.067 or >.05 level of significant difference which means not significant as verbally interpreted.

Development opportunities are higher for 0-2 year employees because organizations focus on building foundational skills early. However, performance remains consistent across years of service because once trained, employees, regardless of tenure can meet expected performance standards. This indicates that development is front-loaded, while performance outcomes are more stable and role-based.

Monthly Salary

			W	p	χ^2	df	p	Decision to Ho	Verbal Interpretation
QUALITY	PHP 10,957-21,914	PHP 21,915-43,828	1.1151	0.86	6.13	3	0.106	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	PHP 10,957-21,914	PHP 43, 829-76,669	0.082	1					
	PHP 10,957-21,914	PHP 76, 670-131,484	-3.1702	0.112					
	PHP 21,915-	PHP 43, 829-76,669	-0.8334	0.936					

	43,828								
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-3.5057	0.063					
	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-1.5076	0.71					
QUANTITY	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 21,915- 43,828	0.276	0.997	7.02	3	0.071	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-1.051	0.88					
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-3.553	0.058					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-1.24	0.817					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-3.212	0.105					
	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-0.603	0.974					
EFFECTIVE NESS	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 21,915- 43,828	0.803	0.942	7.31	3	0.063	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-2.44	0.311					
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-2.805	0.194					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-2.399	0.326					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-2.579	0.262					
	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	2.4	0.325					
FINAL RESULT	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 21,915- 43,828	-0.131	1	9.29	3	0.026	Reject	Significant

	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-1.545	0.694					
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-4.035	0.022					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-1.53	0.701					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-3.397	0.077					
	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-0.327	0.996					
DEVELOPM ENT OPPORTUN ITIES	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 21,915- 43,828	-0.0708	1	5.53	3	0.137	Reject	Significant
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-2.4806	0.296					
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-2.2668	0.377					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	-2.3883	0.33					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	-1.5085	0.71					
	PHP 43, 829- 76,669	PHP 76, 670- 131,484	2.4	0.325					
OVERALL EMPLOYE E PERFORM ANCE	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 21,915- 43,828	0.464	0.988	10.3 3	3	0.02	Reject	Significant
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 43, 829-76,669	-2.333	0.351					
	PHP 10,957- 21,914	PHP 76, 670-131,484	-3.868	0.032					
	PHP 21,915- 43,828	PHP 43, 829-76,669	-2.33	0.352					
	PHP 21,915-	PHP 76, 670-131,484	-3.327	0.087					

	43,828								
	PHP 43,829-76,669	PHP 76,670-131,484	1.993	0.494					

This table showed that quality, quantity and effectiveness have no significant differences towards monthly salary, while result, and development opportunities have significant difference. In addition, it resulted in the overall employee performance and monthly salary having p-value of 0.016 which is <.05 level of significance which means there is a significant relationship between the two.

In many organizations, employee performance indicators such as quality, quantity, and effectiveness tend to remain consistent across salary levels because these metrics are typically linked to how well employees perform the tasks assigned to them, rather than their job level or pay grade. This means that a front-line worker earning a low monthly salary can be just as reliable, productive, and precise as a higher-paid manager, especially when clear job expectations and performance standards are in place. However, when it comes to results, which often reflect the impact or scope of an employee's work and development opportunities, significant differences emerge—and these typically favor higher-salaried employees. These differences arise not because lower-paid employees are less capable, but because of structural and systemic factors built into organizational hierarchies.

In this result, it also proves that monthly salary influences how employees perform. It also shows that one of the motivating factors of the workers is their salary and benefits. It concluded that with the higher salary, it is expected to have higher employee performance rating. In the previous result on salary, it showed that they are not satisfied with the salary and benefits they have. However, it contradicted that they still perform well even if they have low salary and dissatisfied. It also concluded that if the employees are receiving higher salary, then they will become more motivated to do their tasks.

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Leadership Style, Work Environment, and Organizational Motivation towards Employee Performance

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Leadership Style

Variable	P-value	Estimate	Decision to Ho	Interpretation
Leadership Style → Job Satisfaction	0.038	0.216	Rejected	Significant/ Moderately Effect

The table shows that job satisfaction moderately affect leadership style. P-value resulted to 0.038 which is <.05 level of significance.

This concluded that when employees are dissatisfied, it can create a challenging environment for leaders. Leaders may need to adjust their approach to address these issues, potentially influencing their leadership style. Employee job satisfaction can moderately influence leadership style because high satisfaction can lead to leaders adopting more inclusive, collaborative styles. Conversely, low satisfaction may encourage leaders to adopt more directive styles, potentially creating a cycle of poor engagement.

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Work Environment

Variable	P-value	Estimate	Decision to Ho	Interpretation
Work Environment → Job Satisfaction	0.873	-0.0175	Failed to Reject	No Significant/ Moderate Effect

This table revealed that job satisfaction has no moderating effect on work environment. It resulted to 0.873 p-value where it failed to be rejected.

The table shows that job satisfaction has nothing to do with work environment because it is shaped by other factors such as policies, infrastructures, or management practices independently of satisfaction levels. Even if employees are satisfied, their satisfaction does not significantly amplify or weaken the effects of these structural elements on the work environment.

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Motivation

Variable	P-value	Estimate	Decision to Ho	Interpretation
Organizational Motivation → Job Satisfaction	0.015	0.255	Rejected	Significant/ Moderately Effect

The table showed that job satisfaction moderately affects organizational motivation. P-value is equivalent to 0.015 or <.05 level of significance.

The findings suggest that job satisfaction serves as a moderating variable in the relationship between organizational factors such as need for achievement, need for power and affiliation and organizational motivation. This implies that the effectiveness of motivational strategies within the municipality is contingent upon the level of employee job satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the summary of findings, the following are concluded:

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Majority of respondents were in the 25-34 age range, dominated by female employees, married, mostly in rank and file position, with 0-2 years in service and earning between the monthly salary of PHP 10,957-21,914.

Assessment on Employee Performance

Employee's performance in the municipality has a very good standing specifically on the effectivity of their work. Effectivity on the performance includes goals and strategies take them on right direction and municipality supports high ethical standards. This means that municipality ensures high ethical standard while setting a clear, shared goals which are essential for guiding employees towards success.

Assessment on Leadership Style

Leaders in the municipality are supportive and achievement-oriented leaders wherein they foster a collaborative supportive environment, and they celebrate team accomplishments and recognizes individual achievements which means that most of the employees could be more motivated and engaged if both are combined in a workforce.

Assessment on Work Environment

Employees are satisfied enough on the overall work environment in the municipality. It also indicates that employees are being satisfied with their co-workers as it resulted with the highest mean. It suggests that employees often want to be treated well and valued.

Assessment on Organizational Motivation

Need for affiliation mainly includes encouragement and supportive workplace. It also means to build strong relationships rather than being empowered to take on advancements or authority within the workplace. Employees prefer valuing teamwork rather than being on top of the other.

Assessment on Job Satisfaction

This proves that the employees in the municipality tends to become more satisfied with their co-workers rather than various factor such as work itself, job promotion, salary, and supervision. It also indicates that there is a problem on the basic job salary and benefits of the employees, which in return will affect their performance.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Profile of Respondents in terms of Age

It reveals that there has nothing to do with the age when it comes to employee performance. It depends solely on the existing knowledge, experience, cognitive ability, trainings or education of the employees whether the employee is younger or older.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Profile of Respondents in terms of Sex

There is a significant difference between employee performance and sex. It also found that since the female employees has the most frequency than male, and performs well according to previous results, it shows that with female workers exhibits higher performance in the municipality.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Profile of Respondents in terms of Civil Status

It shows that civil status has nothing to do with the employee performance, whether they are single, married or even widowed. It means that employees are professional in terms of personal status and able to perform well.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Profile of Respondents in terms of Position

Position has nothing to do with employee performance. It still depends on how motivated and passionate are the employees to do their job. This also implies that both positions can either perform well.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Profile of Respondents in terms of Years of Service

Employee performance and years of service has nothing to do with each other. Performance evaluations often can be subjective, and may not reflect the actual contributions of employees. It may result to low employee performance and biased work environment.

Test of Significant Difference between Employee Performance and Profile of Respondents in terms of Monthly Salary

Monthly salary influences how employees perform. It also shows that one of the motivating factors of the workers is their salary and benefits. It concluded that with the higher salary, it is expected to have higher employee performance rating.

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Leadership Style

Employee job satisfaction can moderately influence leadership style because high satisfaction can lead to leaders adopting more inclusive, collaborative styles. Conversely, low satisfaction may encourage leaders to

adopt more directive styles, potentially creating a cycle of poor engagement.

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Work Environment

Job satisfaction has nothing to do with work environment because it is shaped by other factors such as policies, infrastructures, or management practices independently of satisfaction levels.

Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Motivation

Job satisfaction serves as a moderating variable in the relationship between organizational factors such as need for achievement, need for power and affiliation and organizational motivation. This implies that the effectiveness of motivational strategies within the municipality is contingent upon the level of employee job satisfaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As per the result of the assessment on leadership style, work environment and organizational motivation, the researcher suggests focusing on sustaining strengths, leveraging existing satisfaction, and strategically enhancing long-term organizational performance.

To maintain positive feedback on leadership style, encourage leaders to continue engaging employees, build stronger relationships while sharing a clear vision, and recognizing individual recognition.

In terms of work environment, enhancing and preserving a supportive and inclusive work culture, and continue invest in workplace safety, and work policies.

Regarding the organizational motivation, strengthen intrinsic motivation through career growth and recognition systems. Municipality may create clear career progression paths, trainings and mentorship programs. Launch an internal awards or recognition platform to highly give them motivating factors and empower teams to set and manage their own performance goals aligned with municipal objectives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, praises to Almighty God for His shower of blessings throughout this journey. We would also like to thank our research adviser, statistics adviser, and to all the panelists for their encouragement, guidance, insightful comments, and challenging questions.

Deepest thanks to LGU San Pascual who actively participated in the study, especially the employees. To those who in one way or another became part of this journey and who are very close to my heart that supported me morally and financially. To my classmates and friends who respond to questions and inquiries without hesitation.

Thank you all for being there until the end of this paper. Every single help is very much appreciated. Again, thank you and God Bless!

REFERENCES

1. Atamneh, S. (2019, September). An exploratory study of pay satisfaction among public sector employees in Jordan. *Journal of Public Affairs*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335836451>
2. Bella, K. (2023, August). Exploring the impact of workplace relationships and employee job satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Modern Science and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.59828/ijrmst.v2i8.136>
3. Darmi, A. (2017, December). The performance of the female employees in public service. *MIMBAR Journal Sosial dan Pembangunan*.
4. De Leon, C. M. (2022, June). Job satisfaction and work values of government employees in selected municipalities of Cavite, Philippines. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*.

- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362169445>
5. Fields, B., & Paul, L. (2019). Demographic characteristics influencing financial well-being: A multi-group analysis. *Journal of Financial Research*, 45(2), 215–234. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01480842>
 6. Hayes, A. (2025, January 26). Labor force participation rate: Purpose, formula, and trends. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/participationrate.asp>
 7. Steinmann, B., et al. (2016, December). Need for affiliation as a motivational add-on for leadership behaviours and managerial behaviours. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5177659/>
 8. Tadeja, A., et al. (2024, December). Compensation scheme and financial well-being of government employees in the National Capital Region. *International Journal of Entrepreneur*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387599962>
 9. WalkMe Team. (2024, July 01). 15 tried and tested metrics to measure employee effectiveness. WalkMe Blog. <https://www.walkme.com/blog/measure-employee-effectiveness>
 10. Viviani, C. A., & Castelluci, H. I. (2021, February 18). Productivity in older versus younger workers: A systematic literature review. *Sage Journal*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3233/WOR-203396>
 11. Wang, Y., et al. (2022, June). How supportive leadership promotes employee innovation under uncertainty: Evidence from Chinese e-commerce industry. *Sustainability*, 14(12), 7491. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127491>