

Job Performance of Administrative Officers in Urbiztondo District, Division of Pangasinan I

Reynante S. Palisoc

Palaris Colleges, San Carlos City, Pangasinan

reynante.palisoc001@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: February 15, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18676630

Abstract

The effectiveness of school operations largely depends on the competence and efficiency of Administrative Officers who manage records, personnel processes, resources, and administrative support services. This study was conducted to determine the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in public schools in the Urbiztondo District, Division of Pangasinan I, during School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it assessed job performance across five functional areas: Personnel Records Management, Recruitment and Selection, HR-Related Functions, Property Custodianship, and General Administrative Support, as perceived by Administrative Officers and school heads. It also examined the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered that may affect job performance.

The study employed a descriptive research design with Administrative Officers and school heads as respondents. A structured questionnaire checklist served as the primary data-gathering instrument.

The Average Weighted Mean and t-test for independent samples were used to analyze the data.

Findings revealed that the job performance of Administrative Officers was rated to a high extent across the five functional areas. Results further showed no significant difference between the perceptions of Administrative Officers and school heads, indicating consistency in performance assessment. Moreover, the problems encountered were rated as moderately serious, suggesting operational challenges that need support and intervention.

In conclusion, Administrative Officers demonstrate strong job performance; however, continuous capacity-building and institutional support are necessary to further enhance administrative effectiveness. The findings served as the basis for the development of an action plan to strengthen Administrative Officers' job performance in public schools.

Keywords: *Administrative Officers, Job Performance, School Administration, Public Schools, Action Plan*

Introduction

Effective school administration is a critical component of educational quality and institutional efficiency. In public schools, Administrative Officers play a central role in ensuring that operational systems function smoothly. Their responsibilities include managing personnel records, supporting recruitment and selection processes, performing human resource-related functions, overseeing property custodianship, and providing general administrative support. The quality of their job performance directly affects the efficiency, accountability, and service delivery of schools.

The Department of Education emphasizes sound administrative systems and competent non-teaching personnel as essential elements of effective school governance. Administrative Officers are expected to demonstrate accuracy, timeliness, compliance with policies, and organizational skills in handling administrative responsibilities. Strong performance in these areas contributes to better coordination, improved documentation, and more responsive support to instructional and leadership functions.

Despite established guidelines and procedures, Administrative Officers may encounter challenges such as heavy workloads, limited training opportunities, resource constraints, and evolving administrative requirements. These challenges may influence the level and consistency of job performance. It is therefore important to assess how Administrative Officers perform their duties and how their performance is perceived by both themselves and school heads.

In view of these considerations, this study aimed to determine the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in public schools in the Urbiztondo District, Division of Pangasinan I. Specifically, it assessed performance across five functional areas, examined differences in perceptions between Administrative Officers and school heads, identified problems encountered in administrative work, and proposed an action plan to enhance job performance. The findings are expected to support school leaders and education officials in strengthening administrative systems and personnel support programs.

Materials and Methods

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to assess the job performance of Administrative Officers in public schools in the Urbiztondo District, Division of Pangasinan I. The design was appropriate for describing existing performance conditions, determining the perceptions of Administrative Officers and school heads, and identifying problems encountered in administrative work without manipulating variables.

Participants

The participants of the study consisted of all Administrative Officers and school heads assigned to public schools in the Urbiztondo District, Division of Pangasinan I, during School Year 2025–2026. Using total enumeration sampling, all 28 Administrative Officers and 28 school heads were included as respondents. They were selected due to their direct involvement in school administrative operations and performance supervision.

Instruments

A structured questionnaire checklist served as the primary data-gathering instrument. The instrument consisted of two parts. Part I measured the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers across five functional areas: Personnel Records Management, Recruitment and Selection, HR-Related Functions, Property Custodianship, and General Administrative Support. Part II measured the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by Administrative Officers in performing their duties.

A Likert-scale format was used to quantify respondents' perceptions. The instrument was adapted from an established questionnaire used in prior studies on administrative job performance and was refined to fit the public school context.

Procedure

Approval to conduct the study was secured from the Schools Division Office of Pangasinan I and the heads of participating schools. The researcher personally administered the questionnaires to the respondents and explained the purpose of the study. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality and anonymity were strictly observed.

Respondents were given sufficient time to answer the instrument. All distributed questionnaires were retrieved, resulting in a complete response rate. The accomplished instruments were checked, encoded, and prepared for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, particularly the Average Weighted Mean, were used to determine the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers and the degree of seriousness of problems encountered. The t-test for independent samples was used to determine whether a significant difference existed between the perceptions of Administrative Officers and school heads at the 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ALONG WITH PERSONNEL RECORDS MANAGEMENT AS PERCEIVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

The results in Table 2 show that the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in terms of personnel records management was rated high by both Administrative Officers (AWM = 3.85) and school heads (AWM = 3.88), with an overall mean of 3.87 interpreted as high extent. This indicates that Administrative Officers consistently and effectively carry out key records management functions such as maintaining and updating personnel files, monitoring attendance and leaves, safeguarding confidential documents, preparing required reports, and coordinating with external agencies. The uniformly high ratings across all indicators suggest that established procedures in personnel documentation and records control are generally well implemented in the schools. The implication is that personnel records systems in the district are reliable and functional, contributing to administrative efficiency and compliance; however, continuous monitoring and periodic training on records management and data privacy can further sustain and enhance performance quality.

Table 2
Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers along with Personnel Records Management as Perceived by the Administrative Officers and School Heads

Personnel Records Management	Administrative Officers		School heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Maintain and update 201 files and personnel information regularly.	3.41	H	3.42	H	3.42	H
2. Record and monitor attendance, leaves, and absences of school personnel accurately.	3.53	H	3.56	H	3.55	H
3. Safeguard confidential records and comply with data privacy standards.	3.89	H	4.02	H	3.96	H
4. Prepare and submit monthly reports of service and attendance on time.	4.02	H	4.05	H	4.04	H
5. File and retrieve personnel records systematically for easy access.	3.58	H	3.63	H	3.61	H
6. Act promptly on personnel leave applications and related requests.	3.78	H	3.79	H	3.79	H

7. Coordinate with external agencies such as GSIS, PhilHealth, and Pag-IBIG on personnel matters.	4.11	H	4.12	H	4.12	H
8. Verify and approve personnel-related transactions as delegated by higher authorities.	3.98	H	3.98	H	3.98	H
9. Ensure accuracy and completeness of all personnel documentation.	4.11	H	4.12	H	4.12	H
10. Maintain orderliness and security in record storage and filing areas.	4.13	H	4.12	H	4.13	H
Total	3.85	H	3.88	H	3.87	H

EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ALONG WITH RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION AS PERCEIVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

The findings in Table 3 indicate that the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in the area of recruitment and selection was rated high by both Administrative Officers (AWM = 3.88) and school heads (AWM = 3.89), with an overall mean of 3.88 interpreted as high extent. This shows that Administrative Officers are consistently performing their roles in supporting fair and transparent recruitment processes, validating applicant documents, coordinating with the Human Resource Management Office, preparing required personnel forms, and maintaining organized recruitment records. The high ratings across all indicators further suggest strong compliance with DepEd hiring guidelines and timelines, as well as professionalism and impartiality in handling selection-related tasks. The implication is that recruitment and selection support systems at the school level are functioning effectively; however, continued capacity-building and process reviews can help further streamline procedures and improve efficiency.

Table 3
Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers along with Recruitment and Selection as Perceived by the Administrative Officers and School Heads

Recruitment and Selection	Administrative Officers		School heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Assist the School Head in implementing transparent and fair recruitment procedures.	3.59	H	3.61	H	3.60	H
2. Validate and verify completeness of applicant and personnel documents.	4.01	H	4.02	H	4.02	H
3. Coordinate effectively with HRMO on appointment, promotion, and deployment matters.	4.02	H	4.02	H	4.02	H
4. Prepare Employee Request Forms (ERF) and other personnel forms accurately.	4.04	H	4.06	H	4.05	H
5. Facilitate communication between the school and SDO regarding personnel recruitment.	3.69	H	3.71	H	3.70	H

6. Maintain organized records of applicant documents and recruitment correspondence.	4.12	H	4.13	H	4.13	H
7. Support the dissemination of recruitment and promotion guidelines to school personnel.	3.98	H	3.98	H	3.98	H
8. Observe impartiality and professionalism during the selection process.	3.78	H	3.79	H	3.79	H
9. Ensure compliance with DepEd hiring and promotion timelines.	4.01	H	4.03	H	4.02	H
10. Recommend improvements to enhance the efficiency of the recruitment process.	3.52	H	3.54	H	3.53	H
Total	3.88	H	3.89	H	3.88	H

EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ALONG WITH HR-RELATED FUNCTIONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

The results in Table 4 show that the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in HR-related functions was rated high by both Administrative Officers (AWM = 3.94) and school heads (AWM = 3.95), with an overall mean of 3.95 interpreted as high extent. This indicates that Administrative Officers are effectively performing key human resource support duties such as processing salary adjustments and benefits, coordinating retirement and separation documents, disseminating HR policies, preparing reports, and monitoring compliance with HR guidelines. The consistently high ratings across indicators suggest accuracy, timeliness, and reliability in handling compensation and personnel transactions in coordination with the HRMO. The implication is that HR-related systems and support services at the school level are well managed, contributing to smoother personnel operations, although continuous updating of HR knowledge and systems improvement strategies can further strengthen service delivery.

Table 4
Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers along with HR-Related Functions as Perceived by the Administrative Officers and School Heads

HR-Related Functions	Administrative Officers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Process salary adjustments, step increments, and benefits in coordination with HRMO.	4.12	H	4.13	H	4.13	H
2. Compute benefits such as maternity, overtime, and proportional vacation pay accurately.	4.11	H	4.12	H	4.12	H
3. Facilitate retirement and separation benefits for endorsement to the SDO.	4.01	H	4.02	H	4.02	H
4. Disseminate updated HR policies and compensation guidelines to school personnel.	4.04	H	4.05	H	4.05	H

5. Maintain accurate records of benefits, payroll adjustments, and personnel transactions.	3.67	H	3.69	H	3.68	H
6. Assist in implementing performance management and rewards programs.	3.78	H	3.79	H	3.79	H
7. Prepare and submit HR-related reports on schedule.	4.11	H	4.12	H	4.12	H
8. Coordinate with HRMO regarding personnel and compensation concerns.	3.42	H	3.43	H	3.43	H
9. Monitor compliance with HR-related policies and guidelines.	4.21	H	4.22	H	4.22	H
10. Recommend strategies to improve HR and compensation systems in the school.	3.94	H	3.95	H	3.95	H
Total	3.94	H	3.95	H	3.95	H

EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ALONG WITH PROPERTY CUSTODIANSHIP AS PERCEIVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

The results in Table 5 reveal that the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in property custodianship was rated high by both Administrative Officers (AWM = 3.82) and school heads (AWM = 3.83), with an overall mean of 3.82 interpreted as high extent. This indicates that Administrative Officers are effectively carrying out their responsibilities in managing school properties, including receiving and documenting deliveries, maintaining updated inventories, ensuring safe storage, conducting regular inventory checks, and safeguarding equipment and materials. The consistently high ratings across indicators suggest that accountability and control measures for school assets are generally well implemented. The implication is that property management systems in schools are functioning reliably, though continued strengthening of tracking systems, reporting procedures, and procurement planning can further enhance transparency and asset protection.

Table 5
Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers along with Property Custodianship as Perceived by the Administrative Officers and School Heads

Property Custodianship	Administrative Officers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Receive, verify, and document deliveries of school supplies and equipment.	3.95	H	3.98	H	3.97	H
2. Maintain and update an inventory of all school properties and learning materials.	3.88	H	3.89	H	3.89	H
3. Store school equipment and materials safely and systematically.	4.18	H	4.19	H	4.19	H
4. Issue supplies and materials with proper documentation and accountability.	3.42	H	3.43	H	3.43	H
5. Conduct regular inventory checks and report losses or discrepancies.	3.98	H	3.99	H	3.99	H

6. Prepare property accountability and disposal reports accurately.	3.79	H	3.79	H	3.79	H
7. Safeguard all school properties against damage, theft, or misuse.	4.18	H	4.19	H	4.19	H
8. Coordinate with the SDO on property inspection and accountability clearance.	3.47	H	3.48	H	3.48	H
9. Implement a tracking system for labeling and monitoring of school equipment.	4.12	H	4.13	H	4.13	H
10. Recommend procurement or replacement of supplies and equipment as needed.	3.19	H	3.20	H	3.20	H
Total	3.82	H	3.83	H	3.82	H

EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ALONG WITH GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AS PERCEIVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

The findings in Table 6 show that the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers in terms of general administrative support was rated at a high extent by both Administrative Officers (AWM = 3.94) and school heads (AWM = 3.96), with an overall mean of 3.95 interpreted as high. This indicates that Administrative Officers consistently and effectively provide essential administrative and operational support, such as preparing reports and correspondence, coordinating school programs, maintaining organized records, ensuring timely submission of required documents, and delivering logistical and technical assistance during school activities. The uniformly high ratings across indicators imply that Administrative Officers play a strong and reliable support role in daily school operations. The implication is that general administrative systems are functioning efficiently, contributing positively to school management and workflow, while continuous process improvement and digital record enhancement can further increase productivity and responsiveness.

Table 6
Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers along with General Administrative Support as Perceived by the Administrative Officers and School Heads

General Administrative Support	Administrative Officers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Assist the School Head in preparing reports, correspondence, and documentation.	4.13	H	4.14	H	4.14	H
2. Encode, reproduce, and organize learning and administrative materials.	3.58	H	3.58	H	3.58	H
3. Support the school planning team in preparing the SIP and AIP.	3.91	H	4.02	H	3.97	H
4. Coordinate with teachers and staff in implementing school programs and activities.	4.01	H	4.05	H	4.03	H
5. Maintain orderliness and cleanliness of office files and workspaces.	3.62	H	3.63	H	3.63	H

6. Prepare and route official communications promptly.	3.78	H	3.79	H	3.79	H
7. Ensure timely submission of reports and compliance documents to the SDO.	4.18	H	4.18	H	4.18	H
8. Operate and maintain office equipment and electronic records.	3.98	H	3.98	H	3.98	H
9. Provide technical and logistical support during school activities and meetings.	4.11	H	4.12	H	4.12	H
10. Perform other administrative functions assigned by the School Head efficiently.	4.13	H	4.12	H	4.13	H
Total	3.94	H	3.96	H	3.95	H

SUMMARY OF THE EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AS PERCEIVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 7 presents the summary of the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers across the five functional areas. Results show that both Administrative Officers (overall mean = 3.89) and school heads (overall mean = 3.90) rated performance at a high extent, with a combined overall average weighted mean of 3.90, interpreted as high. Among the areas, HR-related functions and general administrative support obtained the highest ratings (AWM = 3.95), followed by recruitment and selection (AWM = 3.88) and personnel records management (AWM = 3.87), while property custodianship received the lowest mean (AWM = 3.82), though still within the high range. The very close ratings between the two groups indicate strong agreement in perceptions and suggest consistent and dependable performance of Administrative Officers across operational domains. This implies that administrative systems and support services in the schools are generally well-managed, with opportunities for targeted strengthening in property custodianship to achieve more balanced excellence across all functions.

Table 7
Summary of the Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers as Perceived by the Administrative Officers and School Heads

	Administrative Officers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Personnel Records Management	3.85	H	3.88	H	3.87	H
2. Recruitment and Selection	3.88	H	3.89	H	3.88	H
3. HR-Related Functions	3.94	H	3.95	H	3.95	H
4. Property Custodianship	3.82	H	3.83	H	3.82	H
5. General Administrative Support	3.94	H	3.96	H	3.95	H
Total	3.89	H	3.90	H	3.90	H

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE EXTENT OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 8 shows the test of significant difference in the extent of job performance of Administrative Officers as perceived by Administrative Officers and school heads. The computed t-value of 0.8899 with 4 degrees of freedom is lower than the critical value of 2.776 at the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the two groups across the five functional areas: personnel records management, recruitment and selection, HR-related functions, property custodianship, and general administrative support. The results imply a strong consistency and shared assessment between Administrative Officers and school heads regarding the level of job performance, suggesting that performance standards and expectations are commonly understood and similarly observed in school operations.

Table 8
Significant Differences in the Extent of Job Performance of Administrative Officers Between the Administrative Officers and School Heads

	Teachers		School Heads	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE
1. Personnel Records Management	3.85	H	3.88	H
2. Recruitment and Selection	3.88	H	3.89	H
3. HR-Related Functions	3.94	H	3.95	H
4. Property Custodianship	3.82	H	3.83	H
5. General Administrative Support	3.94	H	3.96	H
Total	3.89	H	3.90	H

*Computed t-value: 0.8899 @ df 4
Alpha: @ 0.05 level of significance
Critical Value: 2.776 , df 4
Decision: accept the null hypothesis
Interpretation: No significant difference*

EXTENT OF SERIOUSNESS OF PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Table 9 presents the degree of seriousness of problems encountered by Administrative Officers (AOs) in performing their duties. The overall Average Weighted Mean of 2.24 indicates that the problems are **moderately serious (MS)**. Among the identified issues, delays due to late submission of required documents from schools or personnel ranked first (AWM = 2.53, Serious), followed closely by backlogs and unfinished transactions caused by multiple roles and responsibilities (AWM = 2.48, Serious). Other moderately serious problems include delays from remote school locations, procurement issues, and limited access to basic supplies. Conversely, issues such as misplaced records (AWM = 1.24) were rated as **least serious (LS)**.

The results imply that while most operational challenges are manageable, certain recurring issues—particularly delays and workload backlogs—have a notable impact on administrative efficiency. Addressing

these key problems through clearer procedures, improved coordination, and enhanced support mechanisms could help streamline operations and improve the overall job performance of Administrative Officers.

Table 9
Degree of Seriousness of Problems Encountered

Indicators	AO		Rank
	Mean	DE	
1. Administrative staff encounter delays due to late submission of required documents from schools or personnel.	2.53	S	1
2. Important records are often misplaced or lost, making it difficult to retrieve documents when needed.	1.24	LS	10
3. Staff are assigned tasks outside their official duties, such as personal errands, which disrupt their regular workload.	2.24	MS	7
4. The absence of clear job descriptions leads to confusion and uneven distribution of responsibilities.	2.06	MS	9
5. Multiple roles and responsibilities result in backlogs and unfinished transactions.	2.48	S	2
6. New staff struggle to perform tasks efficiently due to lack of proper endorsement or handover of duties.	2.19	MS	8
7. Limited access to basic supplies forces staff to use personal funds to meet operational needs.	2.28	MS	6
8. Remote school locations and poor transportation options delay the delivery of documents and materials.	2.39	S	4
9. Workplace conflicts and poor communication among staff members lead to repeated errors and slow processing.	1.71	MS	5
10. Slow and complex procurement procedures hinder the timely acquisition of needed materials and supplies.	2.29	MS	3
Total	2.24	MS	

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the job performance of Administrative Officers in public schools of the Urbiztondo District, Division of Pangasinan I, for the School Year 2025–2026 is generally **high** across all functional areas, including Personnel Records Management, Recruitment and Selection, HR-Related Functions, Property Custodianship, and General Administrative Support. There is **no significant difference** between the perceptions of Administrative Officers and school heads, indicating a shared understanding of performance levels.

Despite the generally high performance, Administrative Officers encounter **moderately serious problems**, particularly delays due to late submission of documents and workload backlogs resulting from multiple responsibilities. These challenges, while not critically debilitating, affect the efficiency and timeliness of administrative operations.

REFERENCES

Asian Development Bank. (2022). *Strengthening education systems in the Philippines: Administrative reform strategies*. <https://www.adb.org>

CHED. (2021). *Graduate pathways for non-teaching personnel in education*. <https://ched.gov.ph>

Civil Service Commission. (2012). *Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012: Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS)*. <https://www.csc.gov.ph>

Civil Service Commission. (2023). *Competency framework for administrative support roles*. <https://www.csc.gov.ph>

Commission on Audit. (2022). *Audit observations on school administrative operations*. <https://www.coa.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2015). *DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015: Guidelines on the implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2019). *DepEd Memorandum DM-OUFDA-2019-0005: Guidelines on the placement and supplementation of Administrative Officers II and III items*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2022). *DepEd Legal Affairs: Policy interpretation on administrative roles in schools*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023a). *Annual report on non-teaching personnel deployment*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023b). *DepEd ICTS: Digital competency framework for school support staff*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023c). *DepEd Planning Service: Operational efficiency indicators for school support staff*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023d). *DepEd Quality Assurance Division: Monitoring tools for administrative performance*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023e). *DepEd School Governance and Operations Division: Operational guidelines for Administrative Officers*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023f). *DepEd External Partnerships Service: Community engagement and administrative coordination*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023g). *DepEd Bureau of Learning Delivery: Impact of administrative support on instructional time*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023h). *DepEd Internal Audit Service: Compliance review of administrative functions in schools*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023i). *DepEd Finance Service: Budget allocation for administrative support roles*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023j). *DepEd Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development: RPMS tools for non-teaching personnel*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2024). *DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2024: MATATAG Agenda implementation guidelines*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

DepEd Central Office. (2023). *Annual report on non-teaching personnel deployment*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

DepEd Human Resource Development Division. (2023). *Professional development roadmap for administrative staff*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

DepEd Region X. (2023). *Administrative Services Performance: Duties and Responsibilities*. <https://main.depeddn.com/articles/ADMINISTRATIVE%20SERVICES%20PERFORMANCE>

DepEd Regional Office I. (2023). *Performance appraisal guidelines for non-teaching personnel*. <https://www.depedro1.com>

DepEd Schools Division of Pangasinan I. (2024). *Local deployment report of Administrative Officers*. [Internal document]

EDCOM II. (2025). *Policy brief on administrative officer deployment and school efficiency*. <https://edcom.ph>

Galinato, P. J. E. (2025). Competencies and performance of Administrative Officers in the DepEd Schools Division Office of Butuan City. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 31(7), 712–726. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14823382>

Griffith, D. A., & Hoppner, J. J. (2013). Improving employee performance through soft skills development. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1352–1359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.019>

I Love DepEd. (2024). *The role of administrative support staff in DepEd*. <https://www.ilovedeped.net/2024/03/the-role-of-administrative-support.html>

Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research. (2025). Vol. 3 No. 5. <https://www.icceph.com>

International Labour Organization. (2022). *Decent work for education support personnel*. <https://www.ilo.org>

Jones, A., & Smith, R. (2020). Challenges in rural school administration: A Philippine perspective. *Southeast Asian Journal of Education*, 12(1), 88–102.

Junio, M. (2024). Administrative officers' support and school performance in GIDA contexts. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 1092–1105. <https://www.icceph.com>

Lazarus, R. (2013). Beyond technical skills: The rise of soft competencies in the 21st-century workplace. *HR Today*, 21(6), 34–39.

Mallon, H. G., & Naanep, N. D. (2025). Role of the administrative officer (AO) in the performance of public elementary schools in Koronadal City. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 1092–1105. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15486918>

Mercy, N. G. (2022). Administrative problems that affect staff performance in DepEd schools covered by Davao del Sur and Davao Occidental Division. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Research and Management*. <https://www.academia.edu/77695602>

Moloney, T. (2021). Decentralization and accountability in education systems. *Education Policy Review*, 18(2), 45–62.

Mustafa, H., Alim, S., & Reyes, C. (2023). Administrative support and school improvement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of School Effectiveness*, 27(3), 145–162.

National Economic and Development Authority. (2023). *Philippine Development Plan 2023–2028: Education Sector Chapter*. <https://www.neda.gov.ph>

OECD. (2021). *Education at a glance: Administrative staffing and school outcomes*. <https://www.oecd.org>

Philippine Business for Education. (2022). *Workforce readiness and administrative capacity in schools*. <https://www.pbed.ph>

Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2023). *Education situationer and policy gaps in rural schools*. <https://www.pids.gov.ph>

Philippine Normal University. (2022). *Training needs assessment of school administrative staff*. [Unpublished thesis]

Philippine Statistics Authority. (2023). *Education workforce distribution by region*. <https://psa.gov.ph>

Rodriguez, M. (2023). Global perspectives on educational administration. *International Journal of Comparative Education*, 19(1), 22–39.

Rosales, J. (2021). Administrative resilience in crisis-era schooling. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 29(4), 233–248.

Seetha, N. (2014). Soft skills and their importance in the workplace. *International Journal of Technology and Management*, 2(1), 12–20.

Slyter, K. (2019). Why soft skills matter in the age of technology. *Rasmussen University*. <https://www.rasmussen.edu>

UNESCO. (2022). *Reimagining education for the 21st century: Administrative roles and school governance*. <https://www.unesco.org>

UNESCO Bangkok. (2023). *School leadership and administrative support in Southeast Asia*. <https://bangkok.unesco.org>



University of the Philippines. (2021). *Administrative efficiency in public schools: A case study.* [Unpublished research]

World Bank. (2021). *Improving school management in low-resource settings: Lessons from Southeast Asia.* <https://www.worldbank.org>

Zulueta, Marlon (2020), Job performance of Administrative officers in Public Junior High Schools, Batangas State University.