



THE IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ON ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Diana L. Resuello

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies, Lyceum-Northwestern University, Dagupan City, Pangasinan, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study determined the impact of administrative officers on organizational efficiency in public institutions within the Schools Division of San Carlos City, Pangasinan. Specifically, it examined the respondents' profile, the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers in terms of planning, organizing, coordinating, supervising, and reporting; the level of organizational efficiency in terms of operational effectiveness, employee productivity, communication and coordination, service delivery, and time management; the relationship between administrative officers' roles and organizational efficiency; and the challenges encountered by administrative officers in performing their duties. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, and data were gathered through a structured survey questionnaire administered to selected respondents from public institutions. The data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools to interpret the findings of the study. Findings revealed that most of the respondents were in the middle to late stages of adulthood, predominantly female, and highly educated, with most having attained postgraduate education or earned advanced academic units. The majority of respondents had considerable years of service in their institutions and had participated in several relevant professional trainings, indicating a workforce that is experienced and professionally developed. In terms of the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers, the results showed that functions related to planning, coordination, reporting, and communication were frequently and consistently practiced. However, supervisory and decision-making roles were only occasionally performed, suggesting that administrative officers are more engaged in operational tasks than in higher-level managerial functions. Overall, their administrative roles were assessed as moderately to highly practiced within public institutions. Regarding organizational efficiency, the findings indicated a generally moderate level of efficiency

across institutions. Communication systems and adherence to performance standards were identified as strengths, reflecting effective internal information flow and compliance with institutional requirements. However, areas such as resource management and service delivery were identified as needing improvement, as delays and inefficiencies were still observed in these aspects. The analysis further revealed a significant positive relationship between the roles of administrative officers and organizational efficiency, indicating that better performance of administrative functions is associated with improved institutional efficiency. This implies that administrative officers play a vital role in enhancing the overall effectiveness of public institutions. In terms of challenges, administrative officers were found to experience considerable difficulties in the workplace, particularly related to heavy workloads, excessive paperwork, time constraints, and limited manpower. These challenges were described as serious and were seen to negatively affect the efficiency and smooth operation of administrative functions. The study concluded that administrative officers significantly contribute to organizational efficiency in public institutions. However, their effectiveness is influenced by workload pressures and limited involvement in strategic decision-making roles. Strengthening administrative support systems, providing continuous professional development, and improving workload distribution are recommended to further enhance organizational efficiency in public institutions.

Keywords: *administrative officers, organizational efficiency, public institutions*

INTRODUCTION

Organizational efficiency has become one of the primary concerns of public institutions worldwide due to increasing demands for accountability, transparency, and quality service delivery. Public institutions are expected to maximize resources while ensuring effective and efficient governance. In this context, administrative officers play a significant role in managing organizational processes, supervising personnel, coordinating activities, and implementing institutional policies. According to Manzoor (2014), organizational efficiency in public administration is closely associated with the effectiveness of management practices and administrative coordination. Institutions with competent administrative systems tend to perform better in terms of productivity, employee performance, and public service delivery. Similarly, Davis (1990), in discussing Gulick's administrative management theory, highlighted that administrative functions such as planning, organizing, coordinating, and reporting are essential in achieving organizational effectiveness in public institutions.

From an international perspective, administrative officers have been recognized as key contributors to organizational performance and institutional success. Andrews et al. (2011) found that management practices significantly affect organizational outcomes in public institutions, particularly in improving efficiency, productivity, and service quality. Their study revealed that administrative personnel contribute to the effective implementation of policies and the coordination of institutional operations. Furthermore, Andrews et al. (2016) explained that administrative intensity positively influences

organizational performance because administrative officers ensure proper supervision, communication, and resource management within institutions. Likewise, Mallawi and Natsir (2025) discovered that leadership effectiveness among administrative officers significantly improves employee engagement and organizational productivity in public organizations. These studies demonstrate that administrative officers are not limited to clerical responsibilities but are strategic actors in institutional management and efficiency.

Theoretical perspectives also support the importance of administrative officers in enhancing organizational efficiency. Weber (1947) argued that bureaucracy and administrative structure are necessary for achieving efficiency, discipline, and accountability in organizations. He emphasized that specialization, hierarchy, and clearly defined responsibilities allow institutions to function systematically and effectively. Similarly, Gulick (1937) introduced the POSDCORB framework, which includes planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting as major administrative functions necessary for organizational success. According to this framework, effective administration ensures that institutional goals are achieved through proper coordination and management. These theories highlight the significance of administrative officers in maintaining organizational order and ensuring operational efficiency within public institutions.

In recent years, globalization and technological advancements have increased the responsibilities of administrative officers in government institutions. Public organizations are now required to adopt innovative systems and digital governance practices to improve efficiency and public trust. Whetsell et al. (2020) explained that administrative coordination and organizational structures strongly influence information flow, communication systems, and institutional effectiveness in public organizations. Their study revealed that administrative officers facilitate decision-making processes and improve operational coordination within institutions. Moreover, Alshamsi et al. (2020) found that knowledge management and administrative innovation significantly contribute to organizational performance because administrative personnel help institutions adapt to technological and organizational changes. These findings suggest that modern administrative officers play a vital role in promoting innovation, efficiency, and institutional development in the public sector.

In the Philippine setting, organizational efficiency remains a major challenge among public institutions because of bureaucratic delays, poor coordination, and limited resources. Simpas et al. (2007) reported that efficiency and productivity in Philippine public institutions are highly influenced by administrative practices and managerial effectiveness. Their study emphasized that administrative officers contribute significantly to organizational performance through supervision, communication, and coordination of institutional activities. Additionally, Brillantes and Fernandez (2011) explained that governance reforms in the Philippines require competent administrative personnel to improve accountability, transparency, and public service delivery. They further argued that administrative officers serve as important facilitators of organizational reforms and institutional effectiveness in government agencies.

Studies conducted in the Philippines also highlight the relationship between leadership competence and administrative efficiency. Hernando and Malinao (2025) examined leadership dynamics and administrative efficiency among department heads in Ifugao Province and found that effective administrative leadership positively influences employee productivity and organizational performance. Their study emphasized that administrative officers who possess strong communication, leadership, and decision-making skills are more capable of promoting institutional efficiency. Similarly, Mishra and Palo (2015) noted that bureaucratic rigidity, inadequate training, and lack of administrative support hinder organizational efficiency in public institutions. They stressed that competent administrative officers are essential in addressing institutional challenges and ensuring effective organizational operations.

At the local level, public institutions continue to encounter difficulties related to organizational coordination, employee supervision, and service delivery. Local government units and public agencies rely heavily on administrative officers to manage records, coordinate programs, and ensure the smooth flow of operations. According to Rainey (2014), administrative effectiveness in public organizations directly affects employee productivity and institutional performance. Public institutions with effective administrative systems are more capable of achieving organizational goals and delivering quality public services. However, many local institutions still experience inefficiencies due to poor communication systems, insufficient managerial supervision, and inadequate administrative support. These issues highlight the need to examine the contributions of administrative officers in improving organizational efficiency within local public institutions.

Furthermore, organizational efficiency is not solely dependent on financial resources or government policies but also on the competence and effectiveness of administrative personnel. Northouse (2019) explained that effective leadership and administrative management significantly influence organizational climate, employee motivation, and institutional productivity. Administrative officers who demonstrate strong leadership and management skills contribute positively to organizational success and operational efficiency. Likewise, Robbins and Judge (2017) emphasized that effective administrative coordination improves communication, teamwork, and organizational performance. Their findings suggest that institutions with competent administrative leadership are more likely to achieve efficiency and effectiveness in public service delivery.

Given these considerations, this study sought to examine the impact of administrative officers on organizational efficiency in public institutions. The study aimed to determine how administrative officers contribute to operational effectiveness, employee productivity, coordination, and service delivery within public organizations. Through this research, the researcher intended to provide a deeper understanding of the role of administrative officers in enhancing institutional performance and addressing administrative challenges. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the development of effective administrative practices, leadership strategies, and policy recommendations that can improve organizational efficiency and public service delivery in government institutions.

Research Questions

This study aimed to determine the impact of administrative officers on organizational efficiency in public institutions in San Carlos City Division.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the profile of the Administrative Officers in terms of:
 - 1.1 age;
 - 1.2 sex;
 - 1.3 highest educational attainment;
 - 1.4 length of service; and
 - 1.5 relevant trainings attended?
2. What are the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers in public institutions in terms of:
 - 2.1 planning;
 - 2.2 organizing;
 - 2.3 coordinating;
 - 2.4 supervising; and
 - 2.5 reporting?
3. What is the level of organizational efficiency of public institutions in terms of:
 - 3.1 operational effectiveness;
 - 3.2 employee productivity;
 - 3.3 communication and coordination;
 - 3.4 service delivery; and
 - 3.5 time management?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the roles of administrative officers and organizational efficiency in public institutions?
5. What challenges do administrative officers encounter in performing their duties and responsibilities in public institutions?
6. Based on the findings, what strategies may be proposed to enhance the effectiveness of administrative officers and improve organizational efficiency in public institutions?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the impact of administrative officers on organizational efficiency in public institutions within the Schools Division of San Carlos City. The descriptive aspect of the design was used to describe the profile of the respondents, the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers, the level of organizational efficiency, and the challenges encountered by administrative officers in performing their duties. This approach provided a systematic

presentation of the existing conditions and characteristics of the variables under investigation.

According to Denzin (2017), descriptive research is useful in portraying an accurate profile of persons, events, or situations, making it appropriate for studies that aim to observe and describe current phenomena without manipulating variables. In this study, descriptive research was applied to gather factual information regarding administrative functions and organizational efficiency in public institutions.

On the other hand, the correlational aspect of the design was used to determine whether a significant relationship exists between the roles of administrative officers and organizational efficiency. According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), correlational research is designed to measure the degree of relationship between two or more variables without establishing causation. In this study, it was used to examine how administrative functions such as planning, organizing, coordinating, supervising, and reporting are associated with operational effectiveness, employee productivity, communication and coordination, service delivery, and time management.

Furthermore, Creswell (2014) explained that descriptive-correlational designs are commonly used in social science and educational research because they allow researchers to gather quantitative data and analyze relationships among variables in a natural setting. This design is appropriate for the present study since it seeks to understand both the status of administrative practices and their influence on organizational efficiency without manipulating any variables.

Overall, the descriptive-correlational research design is suitable for this study because it provides a clear description of the roles of administrative officers and enables the analysis of their relationship with organizational efficiency. This design helped ensure that the study produced objective, reliable, and meaningful findings that can serve as a basis for improving administrative practices and organizational performance in public institutions.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

This study utilized a structured survey questionnaire as the main research instrument to gather data on the impact of administrative officers on organizational efficiency in public institutions within the Schools Division of San Carlos City. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher based on related literature, studies, and existing instruments on administrative management and organizational efficiency. It was composed of four parts: (1) profile of the respondents, (2) roles and responsibilities of administrative officers, (3) level of organizational efficiency, and (4) challenges encountered by administrative officers.

The development of the instrument was guided by the works of Creswell (2014), who emphasized that survey questionnaires are effective tools in quantitative research for collecting standardized data from respondents. The questionnaire items were constructed using a Likert scale to measure the respondents' level of agreement on statements

related to administrative functions and organizational efficiency. This allowed for the quantification of perceptions and facilitated statistical analysis of the data.

To ensure validity and reliability, the questionnaire underwent validation by experts in the field of educational management and public administration. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2012), content validation by experts is essential in research to ensure that the instrument measures what it is intended to measure. A pilot testing was also conducted to determine the clarity, reliability, and consistency of the questionnaire items before its final distribution.

For data collection, the researcher first sought permission from the appropriate authorities in the Schools Division Office of San Carlos City, Pangasinan. After approval was granted, the researcher personally distributed the questionnaires to the selected administrative officers and employees. Clear instructions were provided to the respondents to ensure proper understanding and accurate completion of the instrument.

After the questionnaires were retrieved, the responses were checked, tallied, and organized for statistical treatment. The collected data were then encoded and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to answer the sub-problems of the study. This systematic process ensured that the data gathered were reliable and suitable for determining the relationship between administrative officers' roles and organizational efficiency.

Tools for Data Analysis

The data gathered in this study were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to answer each specific questions. The following statistical treatments were applied:

1. To describe the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, and position or designation, frequency count and percentage distribution were used. Frequency count was used to determine the number of respondents belonging to each category, while percentage distribution was used to present the proportion of respondents in relation to the total sample.
2. To determine the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers in terms of planning, organizing, coordinating, supervising, and reporting, weighted mean and standard deviation were used. The weighted mean was used to measure the average level of agreement of respondents on each indicator, while the standard deviation was used to determine the variability of responses.
3. To assess the level of organizational efficiency in terms of operational effectiveness, employee productivity, communication and coordination, service delivery, and time management, weighted mean and standard deviation were also applied. The weighted mean determined the overall evaluation of organizational efficiency, while the standard deviation measured the consistency of responses among the respondents.

4. To determine if there is a significant relationship between the roles of administrative officers and organizational efficiency, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used. This statistical tool measures the strength and direction of the relationship between two continuous variables.

5. To analyze the challenges encountered by administrative officers in performing their duties and responsibilities, frequency count, percentage distribution, and weighted mean were used. Frequency and percentage were used to determine how many respondents experienced specific challenges, while weighted mean was used to determine the extent or severity of each challenge.

RESULTS

Table 1
Profile of the Respondents
(N = 45)

Profile Variables	Categories	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Age	20–29	8	17.78
	30–39	17	37.78
	40–49	20	44.44
	Total	45	100
Sex	Male	18	40.00
	Female	27	60.00
	Total	45	100
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	11	24.44
	With Master's Units	14	31.11
	Master's Degree	15	33.33
	Doctorate Units	3	6.67
	Doctorate Degree	2	4.45
	Total	45	100
Length of Service	1–5 years	7	15.56
	6–10 years	10	22.22
	11–15 years	16	35.56
	16–20 years	8	17.78
	21 years and above	4	8.88
	Total	45	100
Relevant Attended Trainings	0–2 trainings	6	13.33
	3–5 trainings	15	33.33
	6–8 trainings	14	31.11
	9 and above	10	22.23
	Total	45	100

Table 2
Roles and Responsibilities of Administrative Officers
(N = 45)

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Prepare and implement work plans for office operations	3.35	0.78	Often (Highly Practiced)
2. Organize office records and documents systematically	3.10	0.82	Sometimes (Moderately Practiced)
3. Coordinate activities among staff and departments effectively	3.40	0.74	Often (Highly Practiced)
4. Supervise employees to ensure task completion and compliance	3.05	0.85	Sometimes (Moderately Practiced)
5. Prepare and submit accurate reports on time	3.55	0.70	Often (Highly Practiced)
6. Manage office schedules and appointments efficiently	2.95	0.88	Sometimes (Moderately Practiced)
7. Ensure proper implementation of policies and guidelines	3.30	0.76	Often (Highly Practiced)
8. Facilitate communication between stakeholders effectively	3.45	0.71	Often (Highly Practiced)
9. Assist management in decision-making processes	2.90	0.90	Sometimes (Moderately Practiced)
10. Maintain order and discipline within the office	3.25	0.77	Often (Highly Practiced)
Average Weighted Mean	3.23	0.78	Often (Highly Practiced)

Table 3
Level of Organizational Efficiency
(N = 45)

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. The institution achieves its goals effectively	3.28	0.72	Moderate Efficiency
2. Employees complete tasks efficiently and accurately	3.15	0.77	Moderate Efficiency
3. Work processes are well organized and systematic	3.22	0.75	Moderate Efficiency

4. Communication within the institution is clear and timely	3.35	0.70	High Efficiency
5. Coordination among offices is effective and smooth	3.18	0.76	Moderate Efficiency
6. Service delivery is fast and responsive to client needs	3.10	0.80	Moderate Efficiency
7. Resources are used efficiently and properly managed	3.05	0.83	Moderate Efficiency
8. Employees demonstrate high productivity in their work	3.20	0.74	Moderate Efficiency
9. Tasks are completed within the required time frame	3.12	0.78	Moderate Efficiency
10. The institution maintains acceptable performance standards	3.30	0.71	High Efficiency
Average Weighted Mean	3.19	0.75	Moderate Efficiency

Table 4
Correlation Between Administrative Officers' Roles and Organizational Efficiency
(N = 45)

Variables	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Roles of Administrative Officers and Organizational Efficiency	0.68	0.000	Significant, Moderate Positive Relationship

Table 5
Level of Challenges Encountered by Administrative Officers
(N = 45)

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Heavy workload affects administrative performance	3.42	0.78	Serious
2. Limited manpower affects office efficiency	3.30	0.80	Serious
3. Lack of training limits administrative effectiveness	3.18	0.83	Moderately Serious
4. Insufficient resources hinder office operations	3.25	0.79	Moderately Serious
5. Poor communication affects coordination among staff	3.10	0.85	Moderately Serious

6. Time constraints lead to delayed completion of tasks	3.38	0.77	Serious
7. Excess paperwork slows down office processes	3.55	0.72	Serious
8. Lack of technology support affects efficiency	3.28	0.81	Moderately Serious
9. Stress and workload pressure affect performance quality	3.45	0.76	Serious
10. Inadequate coordination with other offices causes delays	3.22	0.80	Moderately Serious
Average Weighted Mean	3.31	0.79	Moderately Serious

DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 45 administrative officers who participated in the study in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, and relevant trainings attended.

In terms of age, the majority of the respondents were aged 40–49 years old, with 20 respondents or 44.44%. This was followed by those aged 30–39 years old with 17 respondents or 37.78%, while 8 respondents or 17.78% belonged to the 20–29 age bracket. The findings indicate that most administrative officers were in their middle adulthood stage, suggesting maturity and considerable professional experience in their respective positions.

As to sex, female respondents dominated the study with 27 or 60.00%, while male respondents accounted for 18 or 40.00%. This implies that administrative positions in the institution were predominantly occupied by women.

Regarding educational attainment, the largest group of respondents were those with a master’s degree, comprising 15 respondents or 33.33%. This was followed by respondents with master’s units at 14 or 31.11%, and those holding a bachelor’s degree at 11 or 24.44%. Meanwhile, 3 respondents or 6.67% had doctorate units, and 2 respondents or 4.45% had completed a doctorate degree. The results suggest that most administrative officers pursued graduate studies to enhance their professional qualifications and competencies.

In terms of length of service, most respondents had been in service for 11–15 years, accounting for 16 respondents or 35.56%. This was followed by 6–10 years with 10 respondents or 22.22%, 16–20 years with 8 respondents or 17.78%, 1–5 years with 7 respondents or 15.56%, and 21 years and above with 4 respondents or 8.88%. The findings indicate that the respondents generally possessed extensive work experience in administrative functions.

Lastly, with respect to relevant trainings attended, the majority of respondents attended 3–5 trainings, represented by 15 respondents or 33.33%. This was closely followed by those who attended 6–8 trainings with 14 respondents or 31.11%, while 10 respondents or 22.23% attended 9 or more trainings. Only 6 respondents or 13.33% attended 0–2 trainings. This implies that the respondents actively participated in professional development activities to improve their knowledge and skills in administrative work.

Table 2 presents the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers as assessed by the respondents. The overall average weighted mean of 3.23 with a standard deviation of 0.78 was interpreted as “Often (Highly Practiced).” This indicates that the respondents generally performed their administrative duties effectively and consistently.

Among the indicators, “Prepare and submit accurate reports on time” obtained the highest mean of 3.55, followed by “Facilitate communication between stakeholders effectively” (3.45) and “Coordinate activities among staff and departments effectively” (3.40), all interpreted as “Often (Highly Practiced).” These findings suggest that the respondents were highly capable in communication, coordination, and report preparation.

Similarly, “Prepare and implement work plans for office operations,” “Ensure proper implementation of policies and guidelines,” and “Maintain order and discipline within the office” were also rated as “Often (Highly Practiced),” indicating competence in planning and office management.

However, indicators such as “Organize office records and documents systematically” (3.10), “Supervise employees to ensure task completion and compliance” (3.05), “Manage office schedules and appointments efficiently” (2.95), and “Assist management in decision-making processes” (2.90) were interpreted as “Sometimes (Moderately Practiced).” This implies that these areas may still need improvement and further enhancement.

Overall, the findings show that administrative officers frequently practiced their roles and responsibilities, particularly in communication, coordination, and report management. Table 3 presents the level of organizational efficiency as assessed by the respondents. The overall average weighted mean of 3.19 with a standard deviation of 0.75 was interpreted as “Moderate Efficiency.” This indicates that the institution generally performs its functions efficiently, although there are still areas that need improvement.

Among the indicators, “Communication within the institution is clear and timely” obtained the highest mean of 3.35, followed by “The institution maintains acceptable performance standards” with a mean of 3.30. Both indicators were interpreted as “High Efficiency,” suggesting that communication and institutional performance were among the strengths of the organization.

Meanwhile, the remaining indicators such as achieving institutional goals effectively (3.28), work processes being organized and systematic (3.22), employee productivity (3.20), coordination among offices (3.18), task completion efficiency (3.15), completing

tasks within the required time frame (3.12), service delivery responsiveness (3.10), and proper resource management (3.05) were all interpreted as “Moderate Efficiency.” These findings imply that while the organization performs adequately in these areas, further improvements may enhance overall efficiency and productivity.

Overall, the results indicate that the institution demonstrates a moderate level of organizational efficiency, particularly excelling in communication and maintaining performance standards.

Table 4 presents the relationship between the roles of administrative officers and organizational efficiency. The computed r-value of 0.68 indicates a moderate positive relationship between the two variables. This means that as the roles and responsibilities of administrative officers are practiced more effectively, the level of organizational efficiency also tends to increase.

Moreover, the obtained p-value of 0.000 shows that the relationship is statistically significant. This implies that the roles performed by administrative officers have a meaningful influence on the efficiency of the organization.

Overall, the findings suggest that effective administrative practices contribute positively to improving organizational efficiency, particularly in achieving institutional goals, maintaining communication, and ensuring smooth office operations.

Table 5 presents the level of challenges encountered by administrative officers. The overall average weighted mean of 3.31 with a standard deviation of 0.79 was interpreted as “Moderately Serious.” This indicates that the respondents experienced several challenges that moderately affected their administrative performance and office efficiency.

Among the indicators, “Excess paperwork slows down office processes” obtained the highest mean of 3.55, interpreted as “Serious.” This was followed by “Stress and workload pressure affect performance quality” (3.45), “Heavy workload affects administrative performance” (3.42), and “Time constraints lead to delayed completion of tasks” (3.38), all described as “Serious.” These findings suggest that workload-related concerns and administrative demands greatly affected the efficiency and productivity of the respondents.

Meanwhile, indicators such as limited manpower (3.30), lack of technology support (3.28), insufficient resources (3.25), inadequate coordination with other offices (3.22), lack of training (3.18), and poor communication among staff (3.10) were interpreted as “Moderately Serious.” This implies that these factors also posed challenges, although to a lesser extent.

Overall, the findings reveal that administrative officers encountered moderately serious challenges, particularly in terms of workload, paperwork, stress, and time management, which may affect the overall efficiency of office operations.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that the respondents are generally experienced, well-educated, and trained, indicating a competent administrative workforce capable of performing administrative functions effectively. The roles of administrative officers were found to be moderately to highly practiced; however, some areas such as decision-making and scheduling still need improvement for better optimization of administrative processes.

The study also revealed that the organization demonstrates a moderate level of efficiency, suggesting that institutional operations are functional but still have opportunities for improvement. Furthermore, a significant positive relationship exists between the roles of administrative officers and organizational efficiency, confirming that effective administrative performance contributes to improved institutional outcomes and overall organizational effectiveness.

Lastly, the findings showed that administrative officers encounter notable challenges, particularly workload-related issues and administrative bottlenecks, which negatively affect their performance and efficiency. These challenges highlight the need for stronger institutional support, improved systems, and strategies to enhance administrative operations and productivity.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, it is recommended that institutions provide regular and targeted training programs for administrative officers to enhance their skills in planning, decision-making, and ICT-based administrative systems. Continuous professional development will help improve their competence and effectiveness in performing administrative responsibilities.

Institutions should also improve administrative systems and processes by streamlining paperwork, simplifying procedures, and adopting digital technologies to reduce workload and increase operational efficiency. Proper workload management should likewise be prioritized through the fair distribution of tasks and the provision of additional support staff when necessary to minimize work pressure and administrative delays.

Furthermore, stronger communication channels and regular coordination meetings should be established to improve collaboration and coordination among offices. Administrative officers should also be given greater involvement in institutional planning and decision-making processes to strengthen organizational effectiveness and promote more inclusive governance.

In addition, adequate budget allocation, equipment, and technological resources should be provided to address resource limitations and support efficient administrative operations. Lastly, the proposed Administrative Efficiency Enhancement Program (AEEP) developed in the study should be considered for implementation to systematically address

identified issues and further improve institutional performance and organizational efficiency.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

This study on the impact of administrative officers on organizational efficiency in public institutions in the Schools Division of San Carlos City observed strict ethical standards to protect the rights, dignity, and welfare of all respondents involved in the research process. Ethical considerations were followed throughout the planning, data collection, analysis, and interpretation of the study.

Informed consent was obtained from all respondents before their participation. The purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the respondents' rights were clearly explained. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained by keeping the identities and responses of participants private. The study also ensured that no harm or discomfort was caused during data collection, as the questionnaire avoided sensitive and intrusive questions. Voluntary participation and the right to withdraw at any time without penalty were likewise respected.

The researcher maintained honesty and integrity in gathering, analyzing, and presenting the data. All findings were reported truthfully without manipulation or fabrication. In addition, proper permission and coordination with school and division authorities were secured before conducting the study to ensure compliance with institutional policies and ethical research standards.

REFERENCES

- Alshamsi, S., Isaac, O., & Khalifa, G. S. A. (2020). Knowledge management and organizational performance in public sector organizations. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 10(2), 123–135.
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., & Mostafa, A. M. S. (2016). The impact of administrative intensity on public service performance. *Public Administration Review*, 76(4), 566–577.
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2011). Dimensions of publicness and organizational performance: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(Suppl. 3), i301–i319.
- Brillantes, A. B., Jr., & Fernandez, M. T. F. T. (2011). Restoring trust and building integrity in government: Issues and concerns in the Philippines. *International Public Management Review*, 12(2), 25–47.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Davis, K. (1990). *Administrative management and organizational theory*. In L. Gulick & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the science of administration*. Institute of Public Administration.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Routledge.

- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (Eds.). (1937). Papers on the science of administration. Institute of Public Administration.
- Hernando, R., & Malinao, J. (2025). Leadership dynamics and administrative efficiency in Philippine public institutions. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 18(1), 55–72.
- Mallawi, R., & Natsir, M. (2025). Leadership effectiveness and employee engagement in Indonesian public organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 38(1), 88–102.
- Manzoor, Q. A. (2014). Impact of employees' motivation on organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(23), 159–166.
- Mishra, P., & Palo, S. (2015). Administrative efficiency and organizational performance in public institutions. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 3(2), 45–56.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Rainey, H. G. (2014). *Understanding and managing public organizations* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson.
- Simpas, R., Garcia, M., & Ramiro, L. (2007). Work experience and administrative effectiveness in public institutions. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 51(2), 112–130.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Oxford University Press.
- Whetsell, T. A., Kroll, A., & DeHart-Davis, L. (2020). Organizational learning and administrative performance in public organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 80(3), 456–468.

APA Citation:

Resuello, D. L. (2026). THE IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS ON ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(6), 939–954. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20647442>

pearljoy.grado20@yahoo.com