

# Work-Related Attitudes and Work-Induced Stress: Their Influence on Organizational Effectiveness Among LGU Libacao Employees

Received: 15.05.2025

Revised: 19.06.2025

Accepted: 15.07.2025

**Jessa Mae Villareal Inosanto**

Master in Business Administration, Aklan Catholic College, Kalibo, Aklan, Philippines

jessamaevillorente1@gmail.com

## Abstract

In pursuit of understanding organizational effectiveness within a local government setting, this study examined the influence of work-related attitudes and work-induced stress on organizational effectiveness among permanent employees of the LGU Libacao. A descriptive-correlational research design was used along with the quantitative analysis. Using Parel's formula, a total of 84 respondents were selected through proportional stratified random sampling from a population of 106 employees across 14 offices. Findings revealed that employees generally exhibited good work-related attitudes, experienced low levels of work-induced stress, and demonstrated good organizational effectiveness. No significant differences were found in work-related attitudes, work-induced stress, or organizational effectiveness when grouped by age, sex, civil status, or length of service. However, job position significantly influenced the financial perspective of organizational effectiveness. A strong positive correlation was observed between work-related attitudes and organizational effectiveness, indicating that as positive attitudes increase, organizational effectiveness also increases. Conversely, a strong negative correlation was found between work-induced stress and organizational effectiveness, suggesting that higher stress levels correspond with reduced organizational effectiveness.

**Keywords:** Local Government Unit, Work-related Attitudes, Work-induced Stress, Organizational Effectiveness, Work Environment, Stress Management, Government Employees



## Introduction

The Local Government Units (LGUs) plays a crucial role in building the community by providing services and facilities which are essential to the promotion of the general welfare (Pimentel, 1993). As emphasized by Civil Service Commission (2010), employees are crucial to the operation of a successful and healthy LGUs. Consequently, as employees encounter increasing pressures worldwide (Gallup, 2023 and Remote, 2024), factors such as work-related attitudes and work-induced stress are the critical areas to be considered. Employee attitudes have a substantial impact in an organization's success or failure and poor employee performance can directly hinder organizational effectiveness (Codilla & Quinal, 2019). While, work-induced stress encompasses the negative effects employees experience due to detrimental aspects of their job and have been connected to burnout, decreased motivation, and reduced work performance resulting in negative organizational effectiveness (Mirela & Adriana, 2011; Leka & Griffiths, 2003; Bewell et al., 2014). While there is significant research in private sector, less attention has been paid to public sector employees, particularly in small municipalities like Libacao. The researcher was motivated to conduct this study due the growing importance of employee well-being in achieving organizational goals. By investigating the relationship between these factors, this study aims to offer valuable insights that could help the Libacao LGU enhance its organizational performance. Tackling these challenges will not only boost employee well-being but also elevate the LGU's overall efficiency and

effectiveness, enabling it to achieve its long-term goals of sustainable growth and community welfare.

## Research objectives

The main objective of the study was to determine the influence of the level of work-related attitudes and the level of work-induced stress on the level of organizational effectiveness among employees of LGU Libacao. It specifically examined the respondents' profiles—age, sex, civil status, length of service, and job position—and assessed their levels of work-related attitudes (affective, behavioral, and cognitive), work-induced stress (job demands, job control, and job resources), and organizational effectiveness (financial, service delivery, internal processes, and learning and growth perspectives). The study further explored whether significant differences existed in these variables when grouped according to profile characteristics, and whether significant relationships existed between work-related attitudes and organizational effectiveness, and between work-induced stress and organizational effectiveness.

## Theoretical framework

**ABC theory of attitude.** The theory explained how attitudes are formed and how they influence the behavior and organizational effectiveness employees. Robbins and Judge (2013) posited that an individual's attitude can be better understood by examining its three (3) components namely, affective, behavioral, and cognitive, which are interconnected and each can influence the others. The *affective component* described as the "emotional or feeling segment of an



attitude" (Maio & Haddock, 2010). If an employee has positive feelings about their work, they were likely to show a positive attitude. Conversely, negative feelings are likely to show a negative attitude. These emotional reactions often develop subconsciously and can significantly influence behavior that can hinder organizational effectiveness. The *behavioral component* described as "the intention to act in a specific way toward someone or something" (Maio & Haddock, 2010). If an employee has a positive attitude, they may show behaviors such as increased motivation and engagement. Conversely, negative attitudes often result in behaviors like disengagement and absenteeism. In essence, the behavioral component demonstrates how attitudes guide actions and intentions, either reinforcing or changing the attitude based on the resulting behavior. The *cognitive component* explains the opinion, beliefs, and attributes segment of an attitude (Maio & Haddock, 2010). It shapes attitudes by involving rational evaluations that affect how an individual develops/adjusts one's attitude. If an employee's beliefs align with the organization, they are likely to show a favorable attitude. Conversely, if their beliefs are misaligned, they may show an unfavorable attitude. It helps individuals assess situations rationally, often serving as the foundation for their emotional responses and behavioral intentions (Robbins and Judge, 2013).

**Job demands-resources model.** Introduced by Bakker and Demerouti (2017), was related to this study by providing an integrated framework for understanding the relationship between job demands, resources, and employee

well-being. The model suggests that every job has characteristics--job demands and job resources. It also incorporates two (2) diverse research traditions specifically the stress research tradition and the motivation research tradition, which are frequently used to examine how the work environment influences an individual's performance (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). *Job demands* includes excessive work pressures, role ambiguity, work overload, and other demands that has detrimental impact on employee well-being. In contrast, *job resources* includes social support, rewards and recognition, or autonomy, rewards and recognition, and other resources that allows an individual to combat their job demands. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). When job demands are high and job resources are limited, it creates a harmful work environment that can significantly affect the employee's organizational effectiveness. The model emphasized the importance of balancing an individual's occupation demands and resources to sustain their health and wellness and to optimize organizational effectiveness.

**The balance scorecard (BSC).** The Balanced Scorecard assessed effectiveness through four (4) perspectives namely *financial, customer, internal processes, and learning and growth perspectives*. It addresses critical strategic areas, including the organization's positioning to achieve financial success from the perspective of shareholders (financial perspective), its image and performance as perceived by customers (customer perspective), the key internal processes in which it must excel (internal business processes), and its capacity to sustain improvement and



foster innovation for long-term value creation (learning and growth perspective) (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). The *financial perspective* focuses on ensuring proper management of funds (Fatile et al., 2019). It indicates whether the organization's strategies effectively drive financial success, often measured through profitability, growth, or increasing shareholder value (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). However, in public organizations, this is assessed by how efficiently they achieve their goals and meet the needs of their constituencies (Khomba, 2011). The *customer perspective* highlights the value of customer focus and satisfaction in current management practices. It addresses the key question of how an organization should act toward its customers to achieve its goals (Kaplan & Norton, 1997; Isoraite, 2008). In the context of LGU, this perspective is better framed as the service delivery perspective, focusing on how they provide public service delivery to clients and other stakeholders who rely on government services. The *internal processes perspective* concentrates on identifying and improving areas within the organization that affect service delivery. It highlights the expectations of shareholders, clients, and customers, emphasizing the need to strategically redefine key processes for greater efficiency (Fatile et al., 2019). This perspective addresses the key question of which areas need improvement and which processes the organization should excel in

to meet and exceed public expectations (Isoraite, 2008). The *learning and growth perspective* concentrates on employee development, training, and growth as the foundation for organizational success. Training programs and organizational attitudes that prioritize both employee and organizational learning are critical to achieving long-term goals (Kaplan & Norton, 1997; Isoraite, 2008). This perspective addresses the key question of how an organization can sustain employees' ability to evolve and improve in order to achieve its objectives (Isoraite, 2008).

## Methodology

The study employed both descriptive and correlational research designs. Parel's formula (Parel et al., 1985) was utilized, resulting in the random selection of eighty-four (84) permanent employees as respondents. A researcher-developed questionnaire was used as the primary data-gathering instrument. Each office was personally visited, and formal permission was secured from the respective department heads through the presentation of an approved letter prior to the distribution of the questionnaire. The questionnaires were administered individually, retrieved after completion, and subsequently tallied, analyzed, and interpreted. All responses were treated with strict confidentiality.



## Results and discussions

**Table 1** Profile of the respondents.

Profile Variables	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
<b>Entire Group</b>	84	100%
<b>Age (Years)</b>		
24-36 years old	39	46
37-49 years old	19	23
50-65 years old	26	31
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	28	33
Female	56	67
<b>Civil Status</b>		
Single	32	38
Married	52	62
<b>Length of Service (Years)</b>		
0 to 10 years	46	54
11 to 20 years	19	23
21 years and above	19	23
<b>Job Position</b>		
Key Personnel	12	14
Technical Personnel	20	24
Administrative Personnel	18	21
Support Personnel	34	41

Table 1 showed that majority of the LGU Libacao employees were female, aged 24-36 years old, married, have been

employed for 0 to 10 years, and belong to the support personnel category.

**Table 2** Level of work-related attitudes of the respondents

Work-related Attitudes	Mean	Rank	Description
Affective Component	3.28	3	Good
Behavioral Component	3.38	1	Good
Cognitive Component	3.30	2	Good
<b>Overall Level of Work-related Attitudes</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>Good Work-related Attitudes</b>	

1.00 – 1.49 Poor; 1.50 – 2.49 Fair; 2.50 – 3.49 Good; 3.50 – 4.00 Very Good

Table 2 showed the level of work-related attitudes of the respondents as a whole was good ( $M = 3.32$ ). This result indicated that the respondents regularly exhibit positive workplace behaviors, with the behavioral component being the highest.

This means that the respondents' actions are crucial in influencing their overall attitudes, highlighting the strong influence of observable behavior on their work-related disposition.

**Table 3** Level of work-induced stress of the respondents

Work-induced Stress	Mean	Rank	Description
Job Demands	1.96	1	Low
Job Control	1.94	2	Low
Job Resources	1.88	3	Low
<b>Overall Level of Work-induced Stress</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>Low Work-induced Stress</b>	

1.00 – 1.49 Very Low; 1.50 – 2.49 Low; 2.50 – 3.49 Moderate; 3.50 – 4.00 Severe

Table 3 represents the level of work-induced stress of the respondents as a whole was low ( $M = 1.93$ ). The result indicates that respondents experience low levels of stress across job demands, job

control, and job resources, indicating manageable workloads, appropriate autonomy, and sufficient access to necessary resources in their work environment.

**Table 4** Level of organizational effectiveness of the respondents

Organizational Effectiveness	Mean	Rank	Description
Financial Perspective	2.92	4	Good
Service Delivery Perspective	3.51	1	Very Good
Internal Processes Perspective	3.19	2	Good
Learning & Growth Perspective	3.13	3	Good
<b>Overall Level of Organizational Effectiveness</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>Good Organizational Effectiveness</b>	

1.00 – 1.49 Poor; 1.50 – 2.49 Fair; 2.50 – 3.49 Good; 3.50 – 4.00 Very Good

Table 4 represents the level of organizational effectiveness of the respondents as a whole was good ( $M = 3.19$ ). This means that the respondents prioritize public satisfaction by providing

effective and efficient public service delivery to clients and other stakeholders that rely on government services. They focus on meeting the needs of clients through service competence and quality.

**Table 5** Significant differences of work-related attitudes of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables using Mann-Whitney U Test

Profile Variables	Affective			Behavioral			Cognitive		
	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p
<b>Sex</b>									
Male	45.34	704.50	0.45	42.32	779.00	0.96	42.55	782.50	0.99
Female	41.08			42.59			42.47		
<b>Civil Status</b>									
Single	41.75	808.00	0.82	41.22	791.00	0.70	38.30	697.50	0.21
Married	42.96			43.29			45.09		

\*Level of Significance = 0.05

As to *sex*, male respondents exhibited a good levels of work-related attitudes across affective (Mean Rank = 45.34) and cognitive (Mean Rank = 42.55) components. This may be due to their tendency to manage emotions independently and focus more on achieving organizational goals. Meanwhile, female respondents exhibited a good level of work-related attitudes across behavioral (Mean Rank = 42.59) component. This indicated that they are more collaborative in nature and possess strong interpersonal skills, as they tend to focus on cultivating a positive relationship with colleagues and fostering teamwork and supportive work environment. The test of significance revealed no significant

difference across all components of work-related attitudes.

As to *civil status*, married respondents exhibited a good level of work-related attitudes across all components: affective (Mean Rank = 42.96), behavioral (Mean Rank = 43.29), and cognitive (Mean Rank = 45.09). This may be due to their heightened sense of responsibility, which they tend to be more committed to their roles and prioritize job security and career growth to support their families. They may be willing to work harder and maintain positive work-related attitudes, as they seek stability and long-term career growth. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all components of work-related attitudes.

**Table 6** Significant differences of work-related attitudes of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables using Kruskal-Wallis H Test

Profile Variables	Affective			Behavioral			Cognitive		
	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p
<b><i>Age (Years)</i></b>									
24 – 36	42.49			40.49			41.40		
37 – 49	41.45	0.06	0.97	43.00	0.59	0.75	41.18	0.45	0.80
50 – 65	43.29			45.15			45.12		
<b><i>Length of Service (Years)</i></b>									
0 – 10	41.29			40.98			42.42		
11 – 20	44.82	0.30	0.86	40.39	1.41	0.49	35.18	3.65	0.16
21 years & above	43.11			48.29			50.00		
<b><i>Job Position</i></b>									
Key Personnel	55.83			57.08			54.21		
Technical Personnel	39.45	4.32	0.23	41.18	5.19	0.16	40.25	3.37	0.34
Administrative	41.81			40.83			40.64		
Support Personnel	39.96			39.01			40.68		

As to *age*, the respondents within the 50-65 age bracket exhibited a good level of work-related attitudes across all components: affective (Mean Rank = 43.29), behavioral (Mean Rank = 45.15),

and cognitive (Mean Rank = 45.12). This may be due to their new perspective that as they age, they tend to display more positive outlook toward their work. This aligns with the Socioemotional Selectivity

Theory (Carstensen, 2003), which emphasized that as employee age, they start to focus more on maintaining positive emotions and psychological well-being, whether in the affective, behavioral or cognitive component. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all components of work-related attitudes.

As to *length of service*, respondents who have been employed for 11-20 years exhibited a good level of work-related attitudes across affective (Mean Rank = 44.82) component. This may be due to their mid-career status, where they have accumulated substantial experience and expertise. They may have already reached their career advancements and has likely fostered a strong sense of loyalty, belongingness, and emotional investment. Meanwhile, respondents who have been employed for 21 years and above exhibited a good level of work-related

attitudes across behavioral (Mean Rank = 48.29) and cognitive (Mean Rank = 50.00) components. This indicated that their long tenure has allowed them to developed a deep understanding of their work environment. Their extensive experience, accumulated knowledge, and expertise have enhanced their ability in handling different workplace situations. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all components of work-related attitudes.

As to *job position*, key personnel exhibited a good level of work-related attitudes across all components: affective (Mean Rank = 55.83), behavioral (Mean Rank = 57.08), and cognitive (Mean Rank = 54.21). This may be due to their critical role in performing essential duties and ensuring a smooth and efficient delivery of public services. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all components of work-related attitudes.

**Table 7** Significant differences of work-induced stress of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables using Mann-Whitney U Test

Profile Variables	Job Demands			Job Control			Job Resources		
	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p
<b>Sex</b>									
Male	48.04			41.54			43.50		
Female	39.73	629.00	0.14	42.98	757.00	0.80	42.00	756.00	0.79
<b>Civil Status</b>									
Single	46.11			45.91			43.47		
Married	40.28	716.50	0.29	40.40	723.00	0.31	41.90	801.00	0.78

As to *sex*, male respondents experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job demands (Mean Rank = 48.04) and job resources (Mean Rank = 43.50). This may be due to their tendency to take on additional workload beyond their job descriptions. They are also expected to perform extra responsibilities,

including physically demanding tasks or being assigned in an unsafe and uncomfortable settings. Meanwhile, female respondents experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job control (Mean Rank = 42.98). This indicated that female employees have limited control over their jobs, they may

feel constrained by gendered expectations that limit their ability to influence work-related decisions, particularly in male-dominated offices. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all aspects of work-induced stress.

As to *civil status*, single respondents experienced a higher level of work-induced stress across all aspects: job demands (Mean Rank = 46.11), job

control (Mean Rank = 45.91), and job resources (Mean Rank = 43.47). This may be due to workload distribution and tasks assignment as they are often expected to take on new/additional responsibilities including overtime, since they do not have family obligations. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all aspects of work-induced stress.

**Table 8** Significant differences of work-induced stress of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables using Kruskal-Wallis H Test

Profile Variables	Job Demands			Job Control			Job Resources		
	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p
<b>Age (Years)</b>									
24 - 36	46.46			45.47			43.91		
37 - 49	40.08	1.99	0.37	42.34	1.41	0.49	47.32	2.27	0.32
50 - 65	38.33			38.15			36.87		
<b>Length of Service (Years)</b>									
0 - 10	44.93			44.00			43.78		
11 - 20	43.05	1.81	0.40	47.92	3.75	0.15	47.34	2.91	0.23
21 years & above	36.05			33.45			34.55		
<b>Job Position</b>									
Key Personnel	42.58			27.38			30.58		
Technical Personnel	46.78			47.38			44.55		
Administrative	44.50	1.49	0.68	43.72	5.68	0.13	41.44	3.79	0.29
Support Personnel	38.90			44.32			46.06		

As to *age*, respondents within the 24-36 age bracket experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job demands (Mean Rank = 46.46) and job control (Mean Rank = 45.47). This may be due to high expectations placed on them as the youngest member in the organization, requiring them to perform efficiently and prove their capabilities. Meanwhile, respondents within the 37-49 age bracket experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job resources (Mean Rank = 47.32). This

indicated that they have limitation in accessing job resources, this may be due to reaching a career plateau and feeling like they have limited opportunities for professional growth, particularly if they lack further career advancement. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all aspects of work-induced stress.

As to *length of service*, respondents who have been employed for 0-10 years, experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job demands

(Mean Rank = 44.93). This may be due to being new employees in the organizations, that they may experience greater pressure such as adjusting to new responsibilities, familiarizing to new environment, meeting performance expectations, and establishing boundaries in workload distribution. Meanwhile, respondents who have been employed for 11-20 years, experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job control (Mean Rank = 47.92) and job resources (Mean Rank = 47.34). This indicated that they face situations where they have limited autonomy and insufficient resources to perform their tasks effectively, this may be due to the increasing responsibilities as they gain more experience, along with the frustration of having long tenure without further career advancement. The test of significance revealed no significant

difference across all aspects of work-induced stress.

As to *job position*, technical personnel experienced a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job demands (Mean Rank = 46.78) and job control (Mean Rank = 47.38). This may be due to the intensity and complexity of their workload, requiring in-depth knowledge and expertise in their field. Meanwhile, support personnel exhibited a higher level of work-induced stress in terms of job resources (Mean Rank = 46.06). This indicated that support employees may experience limited access to essential resources, particularly opportunities for learning and skill development, promotions, and compensation and benefits. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all aspects of work-induced stress.

**Table 9** Significant differences of organizational effectiveness of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables using Mann-Whitney U Test

Profile Variables	Financial			Service Delivery			Internal Processes			Learning & Growth		
	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p	Mean Rank	U	p
<i>Sex</i>												
Male	41.70	761.50	0.83	39.64	704.00	0.44	42.32	779.00	0.96	48.34	620.5	0.12
Female	42.90			43.93			42.59			39.58		
<i>Civil Status</i>												
Single	39.61	739.50	0.39	37.64	676.50	0.15	41.02	784.50	0.66	45.2	745.50	0.42
Married	44.28			45.49			43.41			40.84		

As to *sex*, female respondents demonstrated good organizational effectiveness across financial perspective (Mean Rank = 42.90), service delivery perspective (Mean Rank = 43.93), and internal processes perspective (Mean Rank = 42.59). This may be due to their particularity in budgeting, drawing from

their expertise in managing personal finances which ensures that financial resources are well allocated and effectively utilized. Meanwhile, male respondents demonstrated good organizational effectiveness across learning and growth perspective (Mean Rank = 48.34). This indicated that males

are also highly engaged in continuous learning and skill development. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all perspectives of organizational effectiveness.

As to *civil status*, married respondents demonstrated good organizational effectiveness across financial perspective (Mean Rank = 44.28), service delivery perspective (Mean Rank = 45.49), and internal processes perspective (Mean Rank = 43.41). This may be due to their

greater sense of responsibility in their personal lives, which they may also apply in their professional roles. Meanwhile, single respondents exhibit a good organizational effectiveness across learning and growth perspective (Mean Rank = 45.20). This indicated that they may have more flexibility and availability to attend series of trainings or workshops, as well as pursue higher education. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all perspectives of organizational effectiveness.

**Table 10** Significant differences of organizational effectiveness of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables using Kruskal-Wallis H Test

Profile Variables	Financial			Service Delivery			Internal Processes			Learning & Growth		
	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	p
<b><i>Age (Years)</i></b>												
24 - 36	41.40			38.19			38.90			44.79		
37 - 49	43.82	0.16	0.92	46.97	2.34	0.31	45.68	1.61	0.45	42.13	0.80	0.67
50 - 65	43.19			45.69			45.48			39.33		
<b><i>Length of Service</i></b>												
0 - 10	40.89			40.26			39.74			45.39		
11 - 20	40.45	1.49	0.48	45.39	0.87	0.65	46.16	1.33	0.51	38.32	1.47	0.48
21 years & above	48.45			45.03			45.53			39.68		
<b><i>Job Position</i></b>												
Key	63.63			54.71			52.63			55.67		
Technical	32.60			38.43			41.73			47.15		
Administrative	40.61	12.62	0.01*	45.86	4.76	0.19	39.36	2.55	0.47	35.47	6.55	0.09
Support	41.87			38.81			41.04			38.84		

As to *age*, respondents within the 37-49 age bracket demonstrated good organizational effectiveness in terms of financial perspective (Mean Rank = 43.82), service delivery perspective (Mean Rank = 46.97), and internal processes perspective (Mean Rank = 45.68). This may be due to their gained professional experience, which developed them to be more familiar or refined. Meanwhile, respondents within the 24-36 age bracket demonstrated good

organizational effectiveness in learning and growth perspective (Mean Rank = 44.79). This indicated that they are more engaged in continuous learning and skill development. They tend to be more open to acquiring new knowledge, adapting to new technologies, and expanding their capabilities. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all perspectives of organizational effectiveness.



As to **length of service**, respondents who have been employed for 21 years and above demonstrated good organizational effectiveness in the financial perspective (Mean Rank = 48.85). This may be due to their significant experience and accumulated expertise. They may be familiar already with financial planning, budget management, and resource allocation, allowing them to make informed decisions that enhances the organization's financial stability. Meanwhile, respondents with 11-20 years of service, demonstrated good organizational effectiveness in the service delivery perspective (Mean Rank = 45.39) and internal processes perspective (Mean Rank = 46.16). This may also be due to familiarity that enables them to streamline internal workflows and improve operational efficiency. Moreover, respondents with 0-10 years of service, demonstrated good organizational effectiveness in the learning and growth perspective (Mean Rank = 45.39). This indicated that the respondents are more engaged in continuous learning and skill

development. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across all perspectives of organizational effectiveness.

As to **job position**, key personnel demonstrated good organizational effectiveness across all perspectives: financial (Mean Rank = 63.63), service delivery (Mean Rank = 54.71), internal processes (Mean Rank = 52.63), and learning and growth (Mean Rank = 55.67). This may be due to their leadership role and key involvement in decision making, which require them to actively work toward across all perspectives. The test of significance revealed no significant difference across service delivery ( $\chi^2 = 4.76$ ,  $p = 0.19$ ), internal processes ( $\chi^2 = 2.55$ ,  $p = 0.47$ ), and learning and growth perspectives ( $\chi^2 = 6.55$ ,  $p = 0.99$ ). However, a significant difference was found as to job position ( $\chi^2 = 12.62$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ) in financial perspective. Therefore, job position was a determining factor affecting financial perspective of organizational effectiveness.

**Table 11** Relationship between the level of work-related attitudes of the respondents and their level of organizational effectiveness

Variable	Spearman's Correlation Coefficient (r)	p – Value	Relationship	Interpretation
Level of Work-related Attitudes	0.700	0.000*	Significant	High Positive Correlation
Level of Organizational Effectiveness				

\*Level of Significance = 0.05

The Statistical test using Spearman's Correlation Coefficient yielded a value of 0.700, indicating a highly positive correlation between the two variables. Furthermore, the p-value was 0.000, which is less than the alpha level of 0.05.

This indicates that as positive work-related attitudes increases, organizational effectiveness also increases, and vice versa. Therefore, the relationship of the two variables is significant.

**Table 12** Relationship between the level of work-induced stress of the respondents and their level of organizational effectiveness

Variable	Spearman's Correlation Coefficient (r)	p – Value	Relationship	Interpretation
Level of Work-induced Stress	-0.710	0.000*	Significant	High Negative Correlation
Level of Organizational Effectiveness				

\*Level of Significance = 0.05

The Statistical test using Spearman's Correlation Coefficient yielded a value of -0.700, indicating a highly negative correlation between the two variables. Furthermore, the p-value was 0.000, which is less than the alpha level of 0.05. This indicates that as work-induced stress increases, organizational effectiveness decreases, and vice versa. Therefore, the relationship of the two variables is significant.

## Conclusions

The level of work-related attitudes of the respondents indicated that the respondents regularly exhibit positive workplace behaviors. This means that the respondents' actions are crucial in influencing their overall attitudes, highlighting the strong influence of observable behavior on their work-related disposition. These findings aligned with the Self-Perception Theory (Bem, 1972), which asserted that an individual's behavior plays a crucial role in shaping the attitudes they develop. Supporting this, Abun et al. (2021) emphasized that attitude and behavior are inseparable and exhibit a reciprocal relationship. However, these results contradicted with the findings of Wicker (1969), who argued that there is no correlation between attitudes and behaviors. Overall, Millar

and Tesser (1986) accentuated the significance of understanding attitudes as dynamic interactions among cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Neglecting these interrelated dimensions diminishes the complexity of the attitude concept and limits its effectiveness to reliably predict behavior.

The level of work-induced stress of the respondents as a whole was low which indicates that respondents experience low levels of stress across job demands, job control, and job resources, indicating manageable workloads, appropriate autonomy, and sufficient access to necessary resources in their work environment. The result aligned with the Job Demand-Control Model (Karasek, 1979), placing the respondents in the 'low-strain' group, which is characterized by relatively manageable work coupled with a moderate degree of decision-making control and freedom. This was further reinforced by the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), which underscored the importance of maintaining a balance between job demands and resources to promote employee well-being and optimize organizational effectiveness.

The level of organizational effectiveness of the respondents as a whole demonstrated good organizational



effectiveness. The service delivery perspective obtained the highest mean score which means that the respondents prioritize public satisfaction by providing effective and efficient public service delivery to clients and other stakeholders that rely on government services. They focus on meeting the needs of clients through service competence and quality. The results aligned with the study of Drucker (2007), which highlighted that an organization's primary task is to create and keep their clients. Thus, top management are always reminded that in any organizational setting, clients hold the utmost importance, as they shape the organization's success. In line also with the Balanced Scorecard Model (Kaplan & Norton, 1992), acknowledging service delivery perspective as one of the key perspectives in measuring organization success.

There was a significant relationship between the level of work-related attitudes and the level of organizational effectiveness, which revealed a highly positive correlation that indicates that as positive work-related attitudes increases, organizational effectiveness also increases, and vice versa. The findings align with the study of Das and Haider (2020), which emphasizes the role of positive employee attitudes in optimizing the full potential of human resources within an organization, which potentially contributes to improved organizational outcomes. This is further supported by the studies of Gopinath (2020), Yadav (2022), Kaushik (2023), and Jaurigue et al. (2023), who linked positive employee attitudes to increased productivity and performance, shaping the overall work environment, and serving as a vital asset for organizational success. Moreover, Abun et al. (2021) and Sarkauskaitė and

Marmiene (2020), demonstrated how affective, behavioral, and cognitive components can influence workplace behavior, further influencing organizational effectiveness.

There was a significant relationship between the level of work-induced stress and the level of organizational effectiveness, which revealed a highly negative correlation that indicates that as work-induced stress increases, organizational effectiveness decreases, and vice versa. The findings align with the studies of Manalo (2019), which emphasizes that employees experiencing higher level of stress are those with lower organizational effectiveness. This is further supported by the studies of Iskamto (2021), Tesfaye (2022) and Chico et al. (2023), who highlighted that organizational effectiveness depends on the ability of employees to manage their work-induced stress. Moreover, elaborated by the studies of Altindag (2020) and Sardouk and Ali (2022), suggesting that when employees work in a stressful environment, their performance is negatively affected, thus underscoring the importance of fostering a stress-free workplace to enhance both employee and organizational effectiveness.

## Recommendations

To enhance work-related attitudes, the LGU should conduct regular training and team-building activities to promote a positive mindset, improve workplace relationships, and foster inclusivity. Recognition programs, integrated into regular events such as the Monday Flag Ceremony or Employees' Night, are also encouraged to boost morale and engagement. To reduce work-induced



stress, the LGU should implement stress management programs through mental health seminars and wellness activities in collaboration with the GAD and MHO. Clear policies on limiting after-hours communication and respecting leave should be enforced to support work-life balance. Additionally, proper orientation on workload distribution and fair compensation should be provided to ensure employees understand their responsibilities and feel supported.

## Future research implications

Future studies may explore other moderating variables of individual characteristics such as personality traits, coping strategies, or organizational culture in the relationship between work-related attitudes, work-induced stress, and

organizational effectiveness. Researchers are also encouraged to consider both permanent and contractual employees to capture a more comprehensive understanding of workplace dynamics. Additionally, longitudinal research could provide deeper insights into how these variables evolve over time.

## Management implications

The findings highlight the need for LGU management to develop targeted programs that promote positive work attitudes and address work stressors. By investing in training, wellness programs, and support systems, the LGU can create a more supportive and efficient work environment that improves employee performance and contributes to the overall effectiveness of the organization.

## References

Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Marlene, N., Fredoline, J., & Madamba, M. (2021). Effect of Attitude Toward Work, Work Environment on the Employees' Work Self-Efficacy.

Abun, D., Ubasa, A., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M., & Ranay, F. (2021). Attitude Toward the Work and Its Influence on the Individual Work Performance of Employees: Basis for Attitude Management (April 8, 2021). Technium Social Sciences Journal, Vol. 18, 378-394, April, 2021, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3822054>.

Altindag, O. (2020). Relationship Between Stress Management and Job Performance in Organizations. International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478), 9(2), 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v9i2.636>.

Anoraga, P. (2011). Occupational Psychology. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta Publisher.

Bakker, A. B., and Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands-Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 22, 273–285.



Bem, D. (1972). Self-perception Theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 1-62). New York: Academic Press.

Carstensen, L., Fung, H., & Charles, S. (2003). Socioemotional Selectivity Theory and the Regulation of Emotion in the Second Half of Life. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27(2), 103–123.

Chico, A., Asilom, A., Bulicatin, Q., & Nalam, C. (2023). Workplace Stress Management and Job Performance among Employees of New Visayas Elementary School. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. VII.

Chico, A., Guartico, R., Igecalinos, S., & Yagonia, M. (2023). Impact of Stress and Job Performance among Employees in DOLE Philippines in Panabo City.

Civil Service Commission (2010). A Guide for Local Chief Executives on Public Personnel Administration.<http://downloads.caraga.dilg.gov.ph/LGU%20Downloads/a-guide-for-local-chief-executives-on-public-personnel-admin.pdf> Retrieved 2023).

Codilla, K., & Quinal, J. (2019). Work Attitudes Among Office Personnel at MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology, Iligan City Philippines. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*. 6. 10.18196/jgpp.61105.

Das, S. & Haider, A. (2020). A Study on Employee Attitude at the Workplace and Its Relationship with Organizational Outcome with Special Reference to the Iron and Steel Industries. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(4), 1008–1019.

Drucker, P. (2007). *The Practice of Management*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Cambridge.

Esguerra, I. (2020). Work-Life Balance and Job Stress of Employees of a Lone Agricultural College in Bulacan, Philippines. *Journal of Business on Hospitality and Tourism*. 6. 61. 10.22334/jbhost.v6i2.229.

Fatile, J., Yemisi, O., Tomilayo, A.I., & Sanni, O.K. (2019). Improving Public Agency Performance Using Balanced Scorecard in Lagos Internal Revenue Service (LIRS). *Journal of Research in Emerging Markets*.

Gallup (2023). Southeast Asia Countries Stress Levels. Retrieved from <https://seasia.co/2023/11/15/philippine-workers-most-stressed-indonesians-most-relaxed-gallup>.

Gopinath, R. (2020). Role on Employees' Attitude in the Place. *GEDRAG & Organisatie Review*, 33(2), 1461-1475.

Iskamto, D. (2021). Stress and Its Impact on Employee Performance. 3. 142 - 148.

Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1992). The Balanced Scorecard: Measures that Drive Performance. *Harvard Business Review*.



Karasek Jr., R. A. (1979). Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2392498>.

Kaushik, S. (2023). A Study on Unraveling the Impact of Employees' Attitudes Towards the Organization on Organizational Outcomes: A Comprehensive Analysis. *Quest Journals. Journal of Research in Business and Management*. Volume 11 ~ Issue 6 (2023) pp: 143-146.

Khomba, J. (2011). Redesigning the Balanced Scorecard Model: An African Perspective (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).

Leka, S. & Griffiths, A. (2003). Work Organization & Stress: Systematic Problem Approaches for Employers, Managers and Trade Union Representatives. *Protecting Workers' Health Series: No. 3*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

LGU Libacao (2024). Municipal Profile. Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) 2019-2028.

Maio, G. & Haddock, G. (2007). Attitude Change. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* (2nd ed., pp. 565–586). The Guilford Press.

Maio, G. & Haddock, G. (2010). *The Psychology of Attitudes and Attitude Change*. SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446214299>.

Manalo R. (2019). Occupational Stress, Organizational Commitment, Work Engagement of STEM Track Public School Teachers: A Proposed Employee Welfare Program. *Letran Business and Economic Review* 2019; 1(1).

Millar, M. & Tesser, A. (1986). Effects of Affective and Cognitive Focus on the Attitude-Behavior Relation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51. 270-276.

Mirela, B. & Mădălina-Adriana, C. (2011). Organizational Stress and its Impact On Work Performance. *Annals of the University of Oradea, Economi Science Series*, 333-337.

Pimentel, A. (1993). *The Local Government Code of 1991: The Key to National Development*. Metro Manila, Cacho Pub. House.

Remote (2024). Global Life-Work Balance Index 2024. Retrieved from <https://remote.com/resources/research/global-life-work-balance-index>.

Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. 15th Edition, Pearson, Boston.

Sardouk, S. and Ali, H. (2022). Job Stress Impact on Job Motivation and Performance (Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hig:diva-38017>.



Schaufeli, W. & Bakker, A. (2004). Job Demands, Job Resources, and Their Relationship with Burnout and Engagement: A Multi-Sample Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>.

Tesfaye, N. (2022). The Effect of Job Stress on Employee Performance, The Case of Equatorial Business Group PLC. [Master's Thesis, St. Mary's University].

Wicker, A. W. (1969). Attitudes Versus Actions: The Relationship of Verbal and Overt Behavioral Responses to Attitude Objects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25(4), 41–78.