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Abstract
An employee is required to have the exact body of work that deals with the language of systematic, well-organized, and constant manner of productivity in any tertiary educational institution that is empowered to provide a good quality of work with due respect to educational progress and its practical applications. It supplements the interactive way of solving multi-factorial dimensions of employee productivity through Higher Thinking Skills of coping and establishing a growing educational institution. Most faculty and employees do understand their obligation to become more productive which allows them to become worthwhile individuals involved in understanding the role and achievement of multi-factorial dimensions of work such as quality of teaching, research, and the nature of public service. However, it is intended to call the attention of administrators, faculty, and employees of the educational system by doing a comprehensive and interactive supplement of work which significantly manifests its multi-factorial dimensions as the total package of the system. Their entire interest should be enlightened through forming collaborative and direct encouragement, determination, and patience with effective way of educational living that will sufficiently overcomes strenuous difficulties in relationships with each other together with the system which appreciates implementation and use of interactive development plan.
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1. Introduction
This study is important because today's environment has placed increasing pressure on organizations both in government and industry to accomplish more with less. Meeting this challenge through higher productivity is possible, it gave information about how employee can be more effective and efficient within the organization. It is important to understand the level of impact on the productivity of faculty, administrators, and employee in selected private tertiary educational institutions on the following factors; job demand, job scope, situational restraint, role ambiguity, work stress, organizational policy, structure and organizational communication.

The 2010 Commission on Higher Education Report says, that professors of future teachers and leaders need “depth of disciplinary knowledge for them to be able to teach effectively and efficiently serving as the major courses of field of high extent of productivity. As the university moves on towards accreditation, that is to ensure quality education and maintain competitive edge in providing learners with relevant knowledge and skills, there is a necessity to dissect problems confronting the faculty’s responsibility considering the indispensable roles they are tasked to perform. The process, however, does not end by inquiring about these multi-factorial dimensions of employee’s productivity. Most importantly, solutions must also be offered to fully address this concern, hence the main goal of this study is to plan a faculty development program to help them cope with the problem encountered on productivity.

Although many studies have been done previously and much have been said concerning multi-factorial dimensions of employee productivity, the study was made different since the group of respondents being considered are the full-time and part-time faculty in the selected private tertiary educational institutions in Manila and the proposed faculty development plan was specifically designed to address their needs. In addition, this study inquired into the significant differences and the relationships between and among multi-dimensional factors on productivity in order to ensure the formulation of a more responsive faculty development program.

The Comprehensive Faculty Program that inject increasing job resources through participative management,
increasing social support, well-worded definitive scope of work that is essential for an employee to accurately and precisely determine the cost of performance which limits the professional boundaries. Meanwhile, it also accumulates the essence of job restraints for a better affection of job satisfaction, job involvement, psychological empowerment, organizational commitment, perceived organization support, and engagement which determine the clear directions about expectations of administrators, faculty, and employee staff role in the job or organization so that clear task requirements are well observed to avoid confusion which will further increase the productivity.

Hence, this study intended to assess the level of productivity of the part-time and full-time faculty in the manner of job demand and scope, situational restraint, role ambiguity, work stress, organizational policy, organizational structures, and organizational communication which is commonly modified by selected tertiary educational institutions in Manila that inform to address a better and comprehensive Faculty Development Plan.

**Research Focus**
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2. Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Theory Z (William Ouchi, 1981), which stresses employee participation in all aspects of company decision making. In the company Z, workers participate in the decision-making process and able to perform many different productive tasks. Such approach, similar to the Japanese company culture, serve as an important driving force in increasing productivity with simultaneous reduction of absenteeism and staff turnover. The Theory Z underlines the importance of some aspects such as work rotation, the expansion of staff’s skills, an advantage of the specialists of wide profile compared to the narrow specialization, and also the need for permanent development and staff training.

In William Ouchi’s opinion, workers want to build friendly relationship based on cooperation with colleagues and employers. In the borders of his theory, workers need the company’s support and highly appreciate the work environment, in which family, culture, traditions, and social institutes have no less important than the work itself. These workers have a highly developed sense of order, discipline and moral commitment to work hard. Lastly, in the borders of Theory Z, workers are expected to work with maximum output if management will support them and care of their well-being.

The important presumption of this theory is that management should be sure in its employees. The Theory Z suggests the importance of development, such as work force, that would save loyalty to their company and prefer to work there for all their lives. In that case, when an employee grows up to the high management level, he will have a thorough knowledge of the company and its activities and he will be able to effectively use the Theory Z to the new employees.

Theory Z represents a humanistic approach to management. Although it is based on Japanese management principles, it is not a pure form of Japanese management. Instead, Theory Z is a hybrid management approach combining Japanese management philosophies with the U.S. culture. In addition, Theory Z breaks away from McGregor's Theory Y. Theory Y is a largely psychological perspective focusing on individual dyads of employer-employee relationships while Theory Z changes the level of analysis to the entire organization.

The core of this study is the level of employee’s productivity with multi-factorial dimension such as job demand, job scope, situational restraint, role ambiguity, work stress, organizational policy, structure and organizational communication. Education must focus energies on the most potent and expensive resources under control, the people who work in schools. The core of the study is interrelated with one another and with some personal profile such as age, gender, educational attainment, position/ designation, employment status and length of service. This theory can provide a basis for understanding on employee’s productivity and calls attention to the important roles of the following multi-factorial dimensions; job demand, job scope, situational restraint, role ambiguity, work stress, organizational policy, structure and organizational communication. From the interrelationship between and among them, a faculty development plan was offered that would guide the faculty for productivity.

3. Research Questions

This study aimed to determine the multi-factorial dimensions of employees’ productivity of selected private tertiary educational institutions in Manila. In the light of the foregoing study, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
   1.1. Age;
   1.2. Gender;
   1.3. Highest educational attainment;
   1.4. Position/designation;
   1.5. Employment status;
   1.6. Length of service?

2. What is the level of impact on the productivity as assessed by the full-time and part-time faculty on the following factors:
   2.1. Job demand;
   2.2. Job scope;
   2.3. Situational restraint;
   2.4. Role ambiguity;
   2.5. Work stress;
   2.6. Organizational policy;
   2.7. Organizational structure;
   2.8. Organizational communication?

3. Is there a significant difference between the assessment of the full and part-time faculty on the impact on productivity as to the aforementioned variables?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and on the level of impact on productivity?

5. Is there a significant relationship between and among multi-dimensional factors on productivity?

6. What are the problems encountered and solutions offered?

7. What faculty development plan may be offered?

4. Research Method

This study made use of the descriptive design to evaluate the acceptability of the Multi-Factorial Dimensions of Employee’s Productivity of selected Private Tertiary Educational Institutions in Manila. The descriptive statistics is concerned with the methods of collecting, organizing, and presenting data appropriately and creatively to describe and assess Employee’s Productivity.

This method focuses on the present condition. Its purpose is to find new truth. The truth refers to many different forms such as increase quantity of knowledge, a new generation or new law, increase insights into factors which are operating,
and a new accurate formation of the problem to be solved and many others.

Moreover, these studies are of large value in providing facts based on scientific judgment, numerous instruments are employed. For instance, test, questionnaire, interviews, observation schedules, checklists scorecards, and rating scales.

Good and Scates (2006) said that descriptive studies are of great value in providing facts on which professional judgment may be based. They further stated that descriptive studies contribute to science because they afford penetrating insights into the nature of what one wishes to develop more complex forms of scientific understanding highlighted to more complex frames of relationship.

The experimental design employed in this study is the sample group with assessed level of impact by full-time and part-time faculty in selected educational institutions. In this design, the part-time and full-time faculty members of the different institutions determine the cause and effect of multi-factorial dimensions of employee’s productivity in terms of the aforementioned variables including the problems encountered and the solutions offered.

A purposive sampling was used in this study. Purposive sampling is a non-random or non-probability sampling which plays a major role in the selection of particular item and/or in making decisions in cases of incomplete responses or observation that usually based on a certain criteria. Since only part-time and full-time faculty members teaching in selected educational institutions are utilized to ensure a wide and in-depth assessment of the Multi-Factorial Dimensions of Employee’s Productivity.

There were three groups of respondents for these studies namely, the administrators, faculty and the office staffs of the selected university within the vicinity of manila.

5. Findings of the Study

The following are the findings of the specific problems raised in the study:

1. The profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, highest educational attainment, position or designation, employment status, and length of service in the six pre-selected institution of Manila appeared that:

1.1. Age

| Age Group | Part-time | Full-time | Total |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| 20-25     | 12        | 21        | 33    |
| 26-30     | 25        | 16        | 41    |
| 31-35     | 37        | 21        | 58    |
| 36-40     | 59        | 21        | 80    |
| 41-45     | 49        | 23        | 72    |
| 46 and above | 46       | 34        | 80    |

Majority of the respondents in terms of age belongs to the age bracket 36-40 and 46-above with a total frequency of 80 or 21.98 percent rank 1.5.

1.2. Sex

| Sex   | Part-time | Full-time | Total |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Male  | 46        | 73        | 119   |
| Female| 90        | 155       | 245   |

The greater number of respondents is female rather than male which garnered 245 or 67.13 percent and 119 or 32.69 percent respectively.
1.3. Educational Attainment

Table 3. Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Educational Attainment

|                      | Part-time |               |               | Full-time |               |               | Total       |               |               |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
|                      | f         | %             | Rank          | f         | %             | Rank          | f           | %             | Rank          |
| Doctorate degree     | 66        | 48.53         | 1             | 67        | 29.39         | 1             | 133         | 36.54         | 1             |
| With doctoral units  | 32        | 23.53         | 2             | 59        | 25.88         | 2             | 91          | 25.00         | 2             |
| With MA/MS units     | 16        | 11.76         | 4             | 50        | 21.93         | 3             | 66          | 18.13         | 3             |
| Master’s degree      | 17        | 12.50         | 3             | 40        | 17.54         | 4             | 57          | 15.66         | 4             |
| Bachelor’s degree    | 5         | 3.68          | 5             | 12        | 5.26          | 5             | 17          | 4.67          | 5             |
| **Total**            | 136       | 100           |               | 228       | 100           |               | **364**     | 100           |               |

The highest educational attainment of the respondents is in line with the doctorate degree having a total of 133 or 36.54 percent.

1.4. Position

Table 4. Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Position

|                      | Part-time |               |               | Full-time |               |               | Total       |               |               |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
|                      | f         | %             | Rank          | f         | %             | Rank          | f           | %             | Rank          |
| Administrator        | 0.0       | 0.0           | 3             | 16        | 7.02          | 3             | 16          | 4.40          | 3             |
| Faculty              | 126       | 92.65         | 1             | 103       | 45.18         | 2             | 229         | 62.91         | 1             |
| Office staff         | 10        | 7.35          | 2             | 109       | 47.81         | 1             | 119         | 32.69         | 2             |
| **Total**            | 136       | 100           |               | 228       | 100           |               | **364**     | 100           |               |

The highest percentage of respondents in terms of position is referred to faculty with obtained frequency of 229 or 62.91 percent followed by office staff, and administrator which garnered 119 or 32.69 percent, and 16 or 4.40 percent respectively.

1.5. Length of Service

Table 5. Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Length of Service

|                      | Part-time |               |               | Full-time |               |               | Total       |               |               |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
|                      | f         | %             | Rank          | f         | %             | Rank          | f           | %             | Rank          |
| 5 years and below    | 62        | 45.59         | 1             | 100       | 43.86         | 1             | 162         | 44.51         | 1             |
| 6-10 years           | 32        | 23.53         | 2             | 59        | 25.88         | 2             | 91          | 25.00         | 2             |
| 11-15 years          | 19        | 13.97         | 3             | 13        | 5.70          | 5             | 32          | 8.79          | 4             |
| 16-20 years          | 15        | 11.03         | 4             | 29        | 12.72         | 3             | 44          | 12.09         | 3             |
| 21-25 years          | 3         | 2.21          | 6             | 15        | 6.58          | 4             | 18          | 4.95          | 5             |
| 26-above             | 5         | 3.68          | 5             | 12        | 5.26          | 6             | 17          | 4.67          | 6             |
| **Total**            | 136       | 100           |               | 228       | 100           |               | **364**     | 100           |               |

Majority of the respondents rendered their length of service of 5 years and below obtaining 162 or 44.51 percent.

2. The level of impact on the productivity as assessed by the full-time and part-time faculty on the following factors significantly appeared that:
Table 6. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty Respondents from Selected Private Tertiary Educational Institution in Manila as to Job Demand

| Job Demand                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                            | WM        | R         | VI            | CM        | R         | VI            |
| I feel flexible at work when doing different tasks in too little time       | 3.68      | 10        | Great Extent  | 3.89      | 7         | Great Extent  | 3.78        | 8         | Great Extent |
| I feel that my skills and abilities increase whenever my job responsibilities increase. | 4.29      | 3         | Great Extent  | 4.44      | 2         | Great Extent  | 4.36        | 2         | Great Extent |
| I feel that there is an increase in my learning ability whenever I perform tasks on job for which I have never been trained. | 4.12      | 6         | Great Extent  | 4.24      | 4         | Great Extent  | 4.18        | 4         | Great Extent |
| Take work at home enables me to finish my job early.                       | 3.87      | 8         | Great Extent  | 3.59      | 10        | Great Extent  | 3.73        | 9         | Great Extent |
| Working under limited time and meeting deadlines helps me to think quickly. | 3.74      | 9         | Great Extent  | 3.69      | 9         | Great Extent  | 3.72        | 10        | Great Extent |
| More help to deal with the demands placed upon employees at work gives me motivation. | 4.04      | 7         | Great Extent  | 4.04      | 5         | Great Extent  | 4.04        | 6         | Great Extent |
| Learning new skills at work makes me productive and efficient.             | 4.60      | 1         | Very Great Extent | 4.54      | 1         | Very Great Extent | 4.57        | 1         | Very Great Extent |
| The more duties and responsibilities I have, the more I become efficient and effective. | 4.21      | 4         | Great Extent  | 3.97      | 6         | Great Extent  | 4.09        | 5         | Great Extent |
| More tasks are given to me to test my mental and physical abilities.       | 4.13      | 5         | Great Extent  | 3.86      | 8         | Great Extent  | 3.99        | 7         | Great Extent |
| Giving challenging works enriches with my skills and abilities.             | 4.42      | 2         | Great Extent  | 4.27      | 3         | Great Extent  | 4.35        | 3         | Great Extent |
| **Total Weighted Mean**                                                     | 4.11      |           |               | 4.05      |           |               | 4.08        |           | Great Extent |

Legend: WM=Weighted Mean VI=Verbal Interpretation CM=Composite Mean R=Rank

The top sub-variable under job demand pertaining to “Learning new skills at work makes me productive and efficient” which reflected 4.57 as composite mean and descriptively interpreted as very great extent.

Table 7. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Job Scope

| Job Scope                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                            | WM        | R         | VI            | CM        | R         | VI            |
| Knowing where to begin a new project, makes me analyze a step by step process in order to make it done well | 4.48      | 2.5       | Great Extent  | 4.33      | 4         | Great Extent  | 4.40        | 3         | Great Extent |
| I am expected to perform duties that are outside my formal job scope, this enhanced my skills and abilities | 3.76      | 10        | Great Extent  | 3.99      | 10        | Great Extent  | 3.88        | 10        | Great Extent |
| The priorities of my job are clear to me, it makes me more productive      | 4.45      | 4         | Great Extent  | 4.20      | 5.5       | Great Extent  | 4.32        | 5         | Great Extent |
| Knowing the basis, on which I am evaluated, makes me aware of my strengths and weaknesses in performing my job | 4.50      | 1         | Very Great Extent | 4.42      | 1         | Great Extent  | 4.46        | 1         | Great Extent |
| Reading my tasks gives me a clear understanding of what duties I need to perform as regards my job | 4.48      | 2.5       | Great Extent  | 4.40      | 2         | Great Extent  | 4.44        | 2         | Great Extent |
| Knowing where to fit in my organization makes me more productive in my specialization. | 4.38      | 5.5       | Great Extent  | 4.35      | 3         | Great Extent  | 4.36        | 4         | Great Extent |
| I feel this job scope includes all the duties and tasks expected for me to succeed in my job | 4.38      | 5.5       | Great Extent  | 4.15      | 8         | Great Extent  | 4.27        | 6         | Great Extent |
| It is clear who really runs things where I work it provides me to work and build smarter solutions for all the challenges. | 4.07      | 9         | Great Extent  | 4.16      | 7         | Great Extent  | 4.12        | 9         | Great Extent |
| My job description needs to be updated to better convey its scope            | 4.26      | 7         | Great Extent  | 4.08      | 9         | Great Extent  | 4.17        | 8         | Great Extent |
| Delegation of responsibility in school is properly distributed which enhanced my activities inside the school | 4.22      | 8         | Great Extent  | 4.20      | 5.5       | Great Extent  | 4.21        | 7         | Great Extent |
| **Total Weighted Mean**                                                     | 4.30      |           |               | 4.23      |           |               | 4.26        |           | Great Extent |

Legend: WM=Weighted Mean VI=Verbal Interpretation CM=Composite Mean R=Rank
The highest sub-variable in line with job scope is “Knowing the basis, on which I am evaluated, makes me aware of my strengths and weaknesses in performing my job” garnered a composite mean of 4.46 or great extent as descriptive interpretation.

Table 8. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Work Stress

| Work Stress                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                            | WM CM     | WM CM     | R  DI          |
| I Don’t seem able to get much work done so I should have the best           | 3.55 3.51 | 3.46 3.57 | 4 Great Extent |
| and knowledge needed by the work and the organization.                     |           |           | 2 Great Extent |
| I find myself getting behind my work so I am ensured that my               | 3.57 3.57 | 3.56 3.57 | 3 Great Extent |
| workload is in line with my capabilities and resources.                   |           |           | 3 Great Extent |
| I make errors or mistakes in my work when I have unclear role             | 3.68 3.70 | 3.73 1    | 2 Great Extent |
| therefore I should have clear information about the details of my job      |           |           | 1 Great Extent |
| in the organization.                                                      |           |           | 1 Great Extent |
| I am easily irritated so I should learn about the various ways of         | 3.35 3.25 | 3.14 3.16 | 6 Moderate Extent |
| managing stress and tension.                                              |           |           | 8 Moderate Extent |
| I often “take my job home with me” in the sense that I think about it     | 3.21 3.16 | 3.11 3.12 | 8 Moderate Extent |
| when I’m doing other things.                                              |           |           | 9 Moderate Extent |
| I quarrel with members of the family so therefore I should have            | 2.47 2.67 | 2.86 2.67 | 10 Moderate Extent |
| balanced between work, family and personal life.                          |           |           | 10 Moderate Extent |
| I have unplanned weight gains I should start exercise regularly to         | 2.84 3.12 | 3.40 3.25 | 9 Moderate Extent |
| become fit and back to my normal weight.                                  |           |           | 6 Moderate Extent |
| My eating habits are inconsistent. I should create a proper schedule on   | 3.32 3.35 | 3.38 3.35 | 7 Moderate Extent |
| how to deal with my work.                                                 |           |           | 7 Moderate Extent |
| At work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well.             | 3.51 3.54 | 3.57 3.54 | 5 Great Extent |
| The amount of traveling I do makes me less enthusiastic about my job       | 3.76 3.60 | 3.45 3.45 | 1 Great Extent |
|                                                                            | 3.33 3.33 | 3.37 3.37 | Moderate Extent |

Legend: WM=Weighted Mean, VI=Verbal Interpretation, CM=Composite Mean, R=Rank

The sub-variable “I make errors or mistakes in my work when I have unclear role therefore I should have clear information about the details of my job in the organization” under work stress got the highest score obtain a composite mean of 3.70 or great extent.

Table 9. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Role Ambiguity

| Role Ambiguity                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                                | WM CM     | WM CM     | R  VI           |
| I feel certain how much authority I have.                                     | 4.01 3.89 | 3.78 3.89 | 6 Great Extent  |
| I have a clear planned goals and objectives for my job                       | 4.43 4.40 | 4.36 4.40 | 2 Great Extent  |
| I feel a lack of policies and guidelines to help me                          | 2.79 3.06 | 3.33 3.06 | 9 Moderate Extent |
| I know what my responsibilities are.                                         | 4.58 4.52 | 4.46 4.52 | 1 Very Great Extent |
| I feel certain on how to be evaluated for a promotion                        | 4.12 4.04 | 3.96 4.04 | 5 Great Extent  |
| I know exactly what is expected of me                                        | 4.23 4.16 | 4.08 4.16 | 3 Great Extent  |
| I am certain as to how my job is linked to other jobs                        | 4.10 4.02 | 3.95 4.02 | 5 Great Extent  |
| I have to work under vague directives and orders.                            | 3.19 3.36 | 3.52 3.36 | 9 Moderate Extent |
| I am told how well am I doing on my job.                                     | 3.93 3.89 | 3.85 3.89 | 7 Great Extent  |
| I feel bursting with energy whenever I receive a clear explanation of        | 3.82 3.90 | 3.98 3.90 | 4 Great Extent  |
| what has to be done                                                          |           |           | 6 Great Extent  |
| Total Weighted Mean                                                          | 3.92 3.92 | 3.93 3.92 | Moderate Extent |

Legend: WM=Weighted Mean, VI=Verbal Interpretation, CM=Composite Mean, R=Rank
The top impact of productivity as to role of ambiguity is pertaining to “I know what my responsibilities are” which possess a composite mean of 4.52 or very great extent.

Table 10. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Situational Restraint

| Situational Restraint                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                                      | WM R VI   | WM R VI   | CM R VI        |
| I need to take a vacation when I needed to refresh my mind from confusions at work.  | 4.15 7    | 4.07 6    | 4.11 6         |
| When faced with a problem I use a systematic approach to have a lesser chance of mistakes and negative outcomes | 4.23 4    | 4.12 5    | 4.18 3.5       |
| On weekends I spend time doing the things I enjoy most to relax myself after being stressed from work | 4.32 1    | 4.22 1    | 4.27 1         |
| Setting aside time to do the things are what I really enjoy to spare myself from being stressed from work | 4.19 5.5  | 4.13 3.5  | 4.16 5         |
| When faced with the need to make a decision, I try to think through the consequences of choices I might make so I can choose the best alternative available that will solve the problem. | 4.24 2.5  | 4.21 2    | 4.23 2         |
| I spend a lot of my free time on hobbies to be relaxed.                                | 3.85 9    | 3.80 9    | 3.82 9         |
| There is at least one sympathetic person at work with whom I can discuss my concerns and make me feel I’m being understood despite how pointless my concerns are. | 3.82 10   | 3.60 10   | 3.71 10        |
| At work, I have at least one good friend I can count on in times I have a problem and help me correct my mistakes | 4.09 8    | 3.98 7.5  | 4.03 8         |
| I can continue working for very long periods of time, Whenever I am able to stick to my priorities in my job | 4.19 5.5  | 3.98 7.5  | 4.09 7         |
| I have techniques to prevent me from being distracted.                                | 4.24 2.5  | 4.13 3.5  | 4.18 3.5       |
| Total Weighted Mean                                                                  | 4.13      | 4.02      | 4.08           |

Legend: WM=Weighted Mean VI=Verbal Interpretation CM=Composite Mean R=Rank

A great extent was observed to the sub-variable “On weekends I spend time doing the things I enjoy most to relax myself after being stressed from work” under situational restraint having a composite mean of 4.27.
The organizational policy with sub-variable “Policies and guidelines are clearly stated in the school manual so I know how to act properly” reflected a composite mean of 4.30 or great extent serve as the top rated sub-variable with this study.

Table 11. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Organizational Policy

| Organizational Policy                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                                     | WM R      | V1        | WM R          | V1          | CM R | V1          |
| Policies and guidelines are clearly stated in the school manual so I know how to act properly | 4.40 3.5  | Great Ext  | 4.20 1        | Great Ext   | 4.30 1  | Great Ext   |
| I found my work significant and timely because school agenda are aligned with the need of the education system | 4.30 6    | Great Ext  | 4.17 2        | Great Ext   | 4.23 4  | Great Ext   |
| I feel I am more inspired to attend in school activities because it is attuned with the school’s vision and mission | 4.38 5    | Great Ext  | 4.07 3        | Great Ext   | 4.22 5  | Great Ext   |
| The vision and mission of the school is clear, so I feel more aware of the goals and objectives my school wants to achieve | 4.49 2    | Great Ext  | 4.05 4        | Great Ext   | 4.27 2.5 | Great Ext   |
| I feel I can accomplish the goals / objectives of the school because they are attainable and realistic | 4.50 1    | Very Great Ext | 4.03 5.5     | Great Ext   | 4.27 2.5 | Great Ext   |
| I feel happy because the needs of the students are prioritized by the school.       | 4.20 8    | Great Ext  | 4.03 5.5     | Great Ext   | 4.11 7  | Great Ext   |
| There is fairness and justice to all because there is a functional grievance committee that decides on issues involving faculty and other concerns | 3.84 10   | Great Ext  | 3.89 7        | Great Ext   | 3.87 10 | Great Ext   |
| I can easily apply the goals and objectives of the school in every work and decisions made in my department | 4.40 3.5  | Great Ext  | 3.88 8        | Great Ext   | 4.14 6  | Great Ext   |
| I feel that there is no bias in my work because of a clear mechanism for faculty and staff evaluation stated in the school manual | 4.05 9    | Great Ext  | 3.73 10       | Great Ext   | 3.89 9  | Great Ext   |
| There are specific committees to decide on disciplinary action for students in school | 4.29 7    | Great Ext  | 3.85 9        | Great Ext   | 4.07 8  | Great Ext   |
| **Total Weighted Mean**                                                             | 4.28      | Great Ext  | 3.99          | Great Ext   | 4.14    | Great Ext   |

Legend: WM = Weighted Mean VI = Verbal Interpretation CM = Composite Mean R = Rank

The organizational policy with sub-variable “Policies and guidelines are clearly stated in the school manual so I know how to act properly” reflected a composite mean of 4.30 or great extent serve as the top rated sub-variable with this study.

Table 12. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Organizational Structure

| Organizational Structure                                                                 | Part-time | Full-time | Composite Mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
|                                                                                         | WM R      | V1        | WM R          | V1          | CM R | V1          |
| My superior has a significant role and authority assigned officially to be more motivated in work | 4.42 3    | Great Ext  | 4.17 4        | Great Ext   | 4.29 3  | Great Ext   |
| I respect my superior’s authority and committee chairmen to establish consistency and order in the workplace | 4.54 1.5  | Very Great Ext | 4.21 3       | Great Ext   | 4.38 2  | Great Ext   |
| Working together by developing and evaluating programs and projects makes me more effective and an efficient teacher | 4.54 1.5  | Very Great Ext | 4.25 1       | Great Ext   | 4.40 1  | Great Ext   |
| Instructors / professors working cooperatively in groups makes me more inspired at work | 4.30 5    | Great Ext  | 4.23 2        | Great Ext   | 4.26 4.5 | Great Ext   |
| The management lets the subordinates know what is expected of them to facilitate openness | 4.25 6.5  | Great Ext  | 4.01 7        | Great Ext   | 4.13 7  | Great Ext   |
| I feel that the management motivates the subordinates to work up to their capacity.      | 4.07 9    | Great Ext  | 3.97 8.5      | Great Ext   | 4.02 9  | Great Ext   |
| Appreciation of high performance of teachers motivates them intrinsically to perform better | 4.40 4    | Great Ext  | 4.11 5        | Great Ext   | 4.26 4.5 | Great Ext   |
| I feel that having control over appointees builds respect.                              | 3.99 10   | Great Ext  | 3.96 10       | Great Ext   | 3.98 10 | Great Ext   |
| The subordinates know their duties and responsibilities so they can perform well in the organization | 4.21 8    | Great Ext  | 3.97 8.5      | Great Ext   | 4.09 8  | Great Ext   |
| There are specific committees for the evaluation system used for the teachers and staff within their term of service to avoid bias and errors | 4.25 6.5  | Great Ext  | 4.02 6        | Great Ext   | 4.14 6  | Great Ext   |
| **Total Weighted Mean**                                                                 | 4.30      | Great Ext  | 4.09          | Great Ext   | 4.19    | Great Ext   |

Legend: WM = Weighted Mean VI = Verbal Interpretation CM = Composite Mean R = Rank

The highest sub-variable of organizational structure is “Working together by developing and evaluating programs and projects makes me more effective and an efficient teacher” possessed a composite mean of 4.40 or great extent.
Table 13. The Impact on Productivity as Assessed by the Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty as to Organizational Communication

| Organizational Communication                                                                 | Part-time WM R VI | Full-time WM R VI | Composite Mean CM R VI |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| There is a frequent release of memoranda/ circulars and meetings to emphasize the importance of working efficiently. | 4.24 6.5 Great Extent | 4.01 8 Very Great Extent | 4.13 6 Great Extent |
| I am satisfied with the dialogues in school in aid of building a harmonious relationship with their co professors and instructors. | 4.13 9 Great Extent | 3.84 10 Great Extent | 3.98 10 Great Extent |
| Leaders do value instructors/professors’ ideas to show respect with each other.               | 4.24 6.5 Great Extent | 4.08 4 Great Extent | 4.16 5 Great Extent |
| I feel important in the faculty whenever there is an involvement of instructors/ professors in the decision – making process. | 4.32 3 Great Extent | 4.04 6 Great Extent | 4.18 4 Great Extent |
| Seeking ideas from seminars and conferences improved my skills and boosted my confidence in teaching. | 4.30 4 Great Extent | 4.16 2 Great Extent | 4.23 3 Great Extent |
| Instructors/ professors are kept informed on current issues in the school in order to settle the problems immediately | 4.18 8 Great Extent | 4.04 6 Great Extent | 4.11 7 Great Extent |
| I feel recognized for my effort in experimenting new ideas and techniques.                     | 4.12 10 Great Extent | 4.04 6 Great Extent | 4.08 9 Great Extent |
| Line channels of communication in school are well defined in the organizational chart and in the office manuals so that everyone can be informed. | 4.26 5 Great Extent | 3.93 9 Great Extent | 4.10 8 Great Extent |
| Encouraging a sharing of ideas maintains good relationship in work                               | 4.46 2 Great Extent | 4.23 1 Great Extent | 4.35 1 Great Extent |
| I feel that frequent activities within the organization helps build a good lively relationship with each other in workplace. | 4.54 1 Great Extent | 4.12 3 Great Extent | 4.33 2 Great Extent |
| **Total Weighted Mean**                                                                        | 4.28 Great Extent  | 4.05 Great Extent  | 4.16 Great Extent      |

Legend: WM = Weighted Mean VI = Verbal Interpretation CM = Composite Mean R = Rank

The organizational communication reflected a sub-variable priority of the respondents pertaining to “Encouraging and sharing of ideas maintains good relationship in work” with a composite mean of 4.35 or great extent as descriptive interpretation.

3. The significant difference between the Assessment of full-time and Part-time faculty on the impact of multi-factorial dimension of employee productivity of this study appeared that:

Table 14. Difference between the Assessment of the Full-time and Part-time Faculty on Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity from Selected Private Tertiary Educational Institution in Manila

| Profile Variables       | Computed t Value | df  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand              | 1.010            | 362 | 1.645         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Job Scope               | 1.313            | 362 | 1.645         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Work Stress             | 0.495            | 362 | 1.645         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Role Ambiguity          | 0.119            | 362 | 1.645         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Situational Restraint   | 1.811            | 362 | 1.645         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy   | 4.494            | 362 | 1.645         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure| 3.104            | 362 | 1.645         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication | 3.283       | 362 | 1.645         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

There is significant difference in the four profile variables that contribute an assessment by the respondents relying to situational restraint with 1.811 computed t-values; organizational policy garnered 4.494 computed t-value, organizational structure which reflected a t-value of 3.104, and organizational communication portrayed t-value of 3.283.

4. The significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the level of impact of multi-factorial dimension of employee productivity of this study appeared that:
The relationship of the profile of the respondents as to job demand is significant in terms of school, age, educational attainment, employment status, and length of service with a computed $X^2$ value of 23.368, 13.544, 19.378, 12.148, and 21.535 respectively.

The job scope has significant relationship to the respondents’ educational attainment garnered 16.134 values, employment status obtained 7.093 values, and length of service reflected 16.151

The level of impact of multi-factorial dimension of employee productivity in terms of situational restraint are significant through the following profile variables: age with a total computed $X^2$ value of 45.902; sex garnered a computed $X^2$ value of 14.834; educational attainment having 44.35 computed $X^2$ value; Employment status with a total computed $X^2$ value of 13.487; and Length of Service reflected 11.185 computed $X^2$ value.

The respondents rejected the null hypothesis in line with age, sex, educational attainment, position, and length of service having a computed $X^2$ value of 26.736, 16.344, 19.854, 21.473, and 12.707 respectively. It generate that the aforementioned variables has significant relation with role ambiguity which is the main serving for multi-factorial dimension of productivity.

### Table 15. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Job Demand

| Profile Variables      | Computed $X^2$ Value | df  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                    | 13.544               | 5   | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                    | 1.158                | 2   | 5.99          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Educational Attainment | 19.378               | 4   | 9.49          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position               | 4.213                | 4   | 9.49          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Employment status      | 12.148               | 2   | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Length of Service      | 21.535               | 5   | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

### Table 16. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Job Scope

| Profile Variables      | Computed $X^2$ Value | df  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                    | 7.417                | 5   | 11.07         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Sex                    | 1.300                | 2   | 5.99          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Educational Attainment | 16.134               | 4   | 9.49          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position               | 0.477                | 2   | 5.99          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Employment status      | 7.093                | 2   | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Length of Service      | 16.151               | 5   | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

### Table 17. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Situational Restraint

| Profile Variables      | Computed $X^2$ Value | df  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                    | 45.902               | 10  | 18.31         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                    | 14.834               | 2   | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Educational Attainment | 44.35                | 8   | 15.51         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position               | 0.194                | 4   | 9.49          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Employment status      | 13.487               | 2   | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Length of Service      | 11.185               | 5   | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

### Table 18. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Role Ambiguity

| Profile Variables      | Computed $X^2$ Value | df  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                    | 26.736               | 10  | 18.31         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                    | 16.344               | 2   | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Educational Attainment | 19.854               | 8   | 15.51         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position               | 21.473               | 4   | 9.49          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Employment status      | 4.456                | 2   | 5.99          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Length of Service      | 12.707               | 5   | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
Table 19. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Work Stress

| Profile Variables          | Computed X² Value | df | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                       | 22.462            | 5  | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                       | 6.011             | 3  | 7.81          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Educational Attainment    | 84.646            | 8  | 15.51         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position                  | 5.435             | 2  | 5.99          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Employment status         | 4.137             | 3  | 7.81          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Length of Service         | 13.189            | 5  | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

There are significant relation with regard to school, age, educational attainment, and length of service which respondents implicate the method of rejection to null hypothesis with the computed X² value 38.366, 22.462, 84.646, and 13.189 respectively. In addition, it justified that the school, age, educational attainment, and length of service are the variables which greatly affect to the performance level or even the job satisfaction in formulating multi-factor dimensions of productivity of the respondents as to work stress.

Table 20. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Organizational Policy

| Profile Variables          | Computed X² Value | df | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                       | 58.695            | 10 | 18.31         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                       | 16.842            | 2  | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Educational Attainment    | 15.661            | 8  | 15.51         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position                  | 1.659             | 4  | 9.49          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Employment status         | 29.164            | 2  | 5.99          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Length of Service         | 42.504            | 10 | 18.31         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

The respondents attest that age, sex, educational attainment, employment status, and length of service are significant with the establishment of organizational policy revealed as rejecting the null hypothesis with computed X² value of 58.695, 16.842, 15.661, and 29.164, and 42.504 respectively.

Table 21. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Organizational Structure

| Profile Variables          | Computed X² Value | df | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                       | 26.320            | 10 | 18.31         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                       | 5.952             | 3  | 7.81          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Educational Attainment    | 30.989            | 8  | 15.51         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position                  | 11.749            | 4  | 9.49          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Employment status         | 4.179             | 3  | 7.81          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Length of Service         | 30.661            | 5  | 11.07         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

There are significant relation with regards to school, age, educational attainment, position, and length of service which respondents implicate the method of rejection to null hypothesis with the computed X² value 25.168, 26.320, 30.989, 11.749 and 30.661 respectively. In addition, it justified that the school, age, educational attainment, position, and length of service are the variables which greatly affect to the performance level or even the job satisfaction in formulating multi-factor dimensions of productivity of the respondents as to organizational structure.

Table 22. Relationship between the Profile Variable of the Respondents and the level of Impact of Multi-factorial Dimension of Employee Productivity in terms of Organizational Communication

| Profile Variables          | Computed X² Value | df | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Age                       | 37.636            | 10 | 18.31         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Sex                       | 2.706             | 3  | 7.81          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Educational Attainment    | 60.483            | 8  | 15.51         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Position                  | 9.67              | 4  | 9.49          | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Employment status         | 3.037             | 3  | 7.81          | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Length of Service         | 5.594             | 5  | 11.07         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
The respondents also claimed that school, age, educational attainment, and position are significant with regard to the level of impact of multi-factorial dimensions of employee productivity as to organizational communication having a computed $X^2$ value of 45.875, 37.636, 60.483, and 9.67 respectively.

5. The significant relationship between and among multi-dimensional factor on productivity of this study appeared that:

| Multi-dimensional Factors | Computed r Value | N  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Scope                 | 0.725            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Work Stress               | 0.175            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Role Ambiguity            | 0.390            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Situational Restraint     | 0.500            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy     | 0.253            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure  | 0.377            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication| 0.280            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

The respondents revealed and acclaimed rejection to the null hypothesis with a computed r value such as 0.725 reflected on job scope; 0.175 affirmed as to work stress category; 0.390 indicated at role ambiguity; 0.500 in line with situational restraint; 0.253 appeared in terms of organizational policy; 0.377 enlist with organizational structure; and 0.280 observed with organizational communication.

| Multi-dimensional Factors | Computed r Value | N  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                | 0.725            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Work Stress               | 0.219            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Role Ambiguity            | 0.392            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Situational Restraint     | 0.600            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy     | 0.450            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure  | 0.556            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication| 0.448            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

The respondents testified to acclaimed rejection to the null hypothesis regarding multi-dimensional factors with the perspective computed r value namely: job scope having 0.725; work stress garnered 0.219; role ambiguity reflected 0.392; situational restraint got 0.600; organizational policy cited 0.450; organizational structure noted 0.556; and organizational communication with 0.448.

| Multi-dimensional Factors | Computed r Value | N  | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|------------------|----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                | 0.175            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Job Scope                 | 0.219            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Role Ambiguity            | 0.396            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Situational Restraint     | 0.296            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy     | 0.114            | 364| 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure  | 0.077            | 364| 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Organizational Communication| 0.066            | 364| 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

There is significant relationship between work stress and the multi-dimensional factors of productivity which respondents testified to acclaimed rejection to the null hypothesis having a perspective computed r value namely: job demand having 0.175; job scope garnered 0.219; role ambiguity reflected 0.396; situational restraint got 0.296; and organizational policy cited 0.114.
Table 26. Relationship between Multi-dimensional Factors and Role Ambiguity

| Multi-dimensional Factors       | Computed r Value | N    | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                     | 0.390            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Job Scope                      | 0.392            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Work Stress                    | 0.396            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Situational Restraint          | 0.507            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy          | 0.493            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure       | 0.420            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication   | 0.373            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

The administrators, faculty, and employee staff revealed and acclaimed rejection to the null hypothesis with a computed r value of 0.390 reflected on job demand; 0.392 affirmed as to job scope category; 0.396 indicated at work stress; 0.507 in line with situational restraint; 0.493 appeared in terms of organizational policy; 0.420 enlist with organizational structure; and 0.373 observed with organizational communication. It generally entails that Role ambiguity is significant to the job demand, job scope, work stress, situational restraint, organizational policy, organizational structure, and organizational communication of the respondents thru multi-dimensional productivity.

Table 27. Relationship between Multi-dimensional Factors and Situational Restraint

| Multi-dimensional Factors       | Computed r Value | N    | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                     | 0.500            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Job Scope                      | 0.600            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Work Stress                    | 0.296            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Role Ambiguity                 | 0.507            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy          | 0.486            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure       | 0.527            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication   | 0.471            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

The Situational Restraint has significant relation to the job demand, job scope, work stress, role ambiguity, organizational policy, organizational structure, and organizational communication with a preference computed r value of 0.500, 0.600, 0.296, 0.507, 0.486, 0.527, and 0.471 respectively.

Table 28. Relationship between Multi-dimensional Factors and Organizational Policy

| Multi-dimensional Factors       | Computed r Value | N    | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                     | 0.253            | 364  | 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Job Scope                      | 0.450            | 364  | 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Work Stress                    | 0.114            | 364  | 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Role Ambiguity                 | 0.493            | 364  | 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Situational Restraint          | 0.486            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure       | 0.725            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication   | 0.691            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

In line with this, there are also items which respondents acclaimed that are significant in terms of Organizational policy such as situational restraint obtained a computed r value of 0.486, organizational structure garnered a computed r value of 0.725, and organizational communication reflected a computed r value of 0.691.

Table 29. Relationship between Multi-dimensional Factors and Organizational Structure

| Multi-dimensional Factors       | Computed r Value | N    | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                     | 0.377            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Job Scope                      | 0.556            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Work Stress                    | 0.077            | 364  | 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Role Ambiguity                 | 0.420            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Situational Restraint          | 0.527            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy          | 0.725            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Communication   | 0.807            | 364  | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance
The items which respondents are significantly acclaimed in terms of Organizational structure are job demand, job scope, role ambiguity, situational restraint, organizational policy, and organizational communication which obtained a computed r value of 0.377, 0.556, 0.420, 0.527, 0.725, and 0.807.

| Multi-dimensional Factors | Computed r Value | N   | Tabular Value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------|----------|----------------|
| Job Demand                | 0.280            | 364 | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Job Scope                 | 0.448            | 364 | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Work Stress               | 0.066            | 364 | 0.103         | Accept Ho| No Significance|
| Role Ambiguity            | 0.373            | 364 | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Situational Restraint     | 0.471            | 364 | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Policy     | 0.691            | 364 | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |
| Organizational Structure  | 0.807            | 364 | 0.103         | Reject Ho| Significant    |

Legend: Alpha = 0.05 level of significance

The variables such as job demand, job scope, role ambiguity, situational restraint, organizational policy, and organizational structure were reflected significant in relation with organizational communication. It highlights the computed r value of 0.280, 0.448, 0.373, 0.471, 0.691, and 0.807 respectively.

6. The problems encountered and the solutions offered to the administrators, faculty, and employee staff appeared that:

| Problems Encountered                                                                 | Part-time WM R VI | Full-time WM R VI | Composite Mean CM R VI |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1. The policies and procedures handbook to teachers and administrators are not clearly defined | 4.29 3 Moderate | 4.44 2 Moderate | 4.36 2 Moderate |
| 2. There is no well-defined system of motivation for employees to meet the expectations of the organization as a whole | 4.60 1 Strong | 4.54 1 Strong | 4.57 1 Strong |
| 3. Some of the faculty members are rude to other teachers | 4.12 6 Moderate | 4.24 4 Moderate | 4.18 4 Moderate |
| 4. Instructors/Professors do not work cooperatively in groups | 4.42 2 Moderate | 4.27 3 Moderate | 4.35 3 Moderate |
| 5. The faculty, heads, administrators and non-teaching staff are not approachable and accommodating | 3.74 9 Moderate | 3.69 9 Moderate | 3.72 10 Moderate |
| 6. Faculty members do not socialize with each other on a regular basis | 4.04 7 Moderate | 4.04 5 Moderate | 4.04 6 Moderate |
| 7. Lack of motivation to get and expect teachers provide enhanced learning along with computer literate skills | 3.68 10 Moderate | 3.89 7 Moderate | 3.78 8 Moderate |
| 8. The equipment and facilities in most departments are very inadequate | 4.21 4 Moderate | 3.97 6 Moderate | 4.09 5 Moderate |
| 9. Faculty members are burdened with lots of paperwork | 4.13 5 Moderate | 3.86 8 Moderate | 3.99 7 Moderate |
| 10. Majority of the faculty members are having difficulty in integrating computer in the class room activities for having limited “know how” to use information technology | 3.87 8 Moderate | 3.59 10 Moderate | 3.73 9 Moderate |
| Average Weighted Mean                                                               | 4.11 Moderate      | 4.05 Moderate      | 4.08 Moderate       |

Legend: WM=Weighted Mean DI=Descriptive Interpretation CM=Composite Mean R=Rank

The table shows that the top two problems encountered by Part-time and Full-time are there is no well-defined system of motivation for employees to meet the expectation of the organization as a whole, and the policies and procedures handbook to teachers and administrators are not clearly defined garnering 4.57 and 4.36 respectively.
The top problem encountered by the administrators, faculty, and employee staff is “There is no well-defined system of motivation for employees to meet the expectation of the organization” garnered 4.60 or strongly agree in which persistent to the reflected a highest offered solution “Innovative approaches to pay, promotions and fringe benefits garnered 4.46 or moderately agree.

7. To further improve the Multi-Factorial Dimensions of employees Productivity of Selected Private Tertiary Educational Institution in Manila, a Proposed Faculty Development Plan is prepared.

6. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the specific problems raised in the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

Most of the respondents are female faculty that belong to age bracket 36-40 and 46-above with doctorate degree having five years and below of length of service.

There is a high-level of impact on the productivity as perceived by the full-time and part-time faculty members in terms of job demand, job scope, situational restraint, role ambiguity, work stress, organizational policy, organizational structure, and organizational communication to achieve a productive, efficient, and effective high extent of job performance.

There is a significant difference in the four profile variables assessed by the respondents relying to situational restraint; organizational policy, organizational structure, and organizational communication.

The multi-dimensional factors have a significant relation to age, educational attainment, and length of service of the administrators, faculty, and employee staff.

Majority of the multi-dimensional factors on productivity is significant between and among each other particularly the job demand, job scope, role ambiguity, situational restraint, organizational structure, and organizational communication.

The convincing motivation enlightens all of the problems encountered by the administrators, faculty, and employee staff to work productively.

The structured Faculty Development Plan is practically conceptualized, appended and crucially overviewed for future use of the selected Tertiary Educational Institution in Manila in achieving Multi-factoidal Dimension of Productivity.
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