



## ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF THE EMPLOYEES AND THE PROGRAMS ON AWARDS AND INCENTIVES FOR SERVICE EXCELLENCE (PRAISE) SYSTEM IN THE THREE CITIES OF ISABELA

May Anthonette L. Bahom, Dr. Ma. Rita A. Reario

Isabela State University

mayabahom07@gmail.com

### Abstract

*This study assessed employees' perceptions of the Program on Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence (PRAISE) and its contribution to employee performance in the three cities of Isabela: Santiago, Cauayan, and Ilagan. Using a descriptive-comparative quantitative design, the study involved PRAISE awardees from 2021–2023 and their immediate supervisors, selected through purposive sampling. Two validated researcher-made questionnaires were administered to measure awardees' perceptions of PRAISE mechanics, criteria, categories, and prizes and incentives, as well as supervisors' assessments of employee performance targets, character/behavior, attendance, compliance, and overall performance dimensions. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, chi-square, and Kendall's tau. Results showed that PRAISE mechanics, criteria, and categories were rated as strictly observed, indicating strong procedural compliance and perceived inclusivity across regular and non-regular employees. Recipients were highly satisfied with symbolic and monetary rewards (plaques, certificates, cash incentives, public recognition) but only satisfied with promotion, salary increase, and additional benefits, revealing a gap between recognition and long-term career development. Supervisors rated PRAISE awardees as excellent across all performance domains, suggesting a highly competent and committed workforce, though slightly lower scores in innovation indicated room for fostering creativity. No significant differences in perceptions were found when grouped by sex and years in service, while age-related differences highlighted varying preferences for intrinsic versus extrinsic rewards. Overall, PRAISE is viewed as a credible and motivating recognition system, but its developmental and strategic potential as a tool for career growth and innovation remains underutilized.*

**Keywords:** PRAISE system, employee performance, recognition and rewards, local government units, organizational performance, motivation

### Publisher's Note

The *Journal of Social Transformation, Governance, and Cultural Studies (JSTGC)* publishes all articles under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)**. This license permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution, and reproduction in any medium or format, provided appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and the source, a link to the Creative Commons license is provided, and any changes made are indicated. The authors retain copyright, and the publisher is granted the right of first publication.



## **Introduction**

Organizational performance as a concept has developed in step with changes in management theory and practice. Earlier definitions, especially in the mid-20th century, treated performance mainly as the degree to which organizations met predetermined goals. Later views broadened this to include efficiency, effective use of resources, and satisfaction of multiple stakeholders. In contemporary terms, organizational performance is commonly understood as an institution's capacity to mobilize its human, financial, and physical resources to achieve objectives and create value for its stakeholders. Systematic performance measurement therefore remains crucial for identifying strengths, addressing gaps, and sustaining institutional excellence (Obeidat, 2016).

The roots of performance measurement lie in Frederick W. Taylor's (1911) scientific management, which emphasized standardized work processes and incentive schemes linked to productivity. His ideas laid the groundwork for formal performance appraisal and reward systems used up to the present. Over time, however, the focus moved beyond mere output and control. Humanistic theorists such as Maslow and Herzberg highlighted the importance of motivation, recognition, and psychological fulfillment in improving performance. This shift marked a transition from purely task- and productivity-centered approaches to more holistic frameworks that value employees' emotional engagement and sense of meaning in their work, particularly in public organizations.

In the Philippine public sector, the Civil Service Commission's Program on Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence (PRAISE) operationalizes these evolving principles of performance management. PRAISE institutionalizes recognition and rewards to foster motivation, innovation, and productivity in government agencies. By honoring exemplary public servants through structured criteria, clear procedures, and transparent incentives, PRAISE integrates Taylor's notion of performance-based rewards with the human relations focus on recognition and motivation. In doing so, it seeks to align individual excellence with institutional goals, thereby strengthening overall organizational performance. Despite its formal adoption, however, the actual experiences and perceptions of employees and supervisors regarding its fairness, implementation, and impact on performance are not yet well documented—particularly in the LGUs of Isabela. This study responds to that gap by examining perceptual differences across demographic and professional variables and by proposing strategies to further enhance PRAISE as a driver of motivation and performance.

Literature shows that recognition and incentives are not experienced uniformly by all employees. Mun and Kodama (2022) observed that gender and age can influence access to rewards and performance-based bonuses in meritocratic systems, with women and younger staff at times receiving fewer benefits due to implicit evaluative biases. At higher organizational levels, Mans-Kemp and Viviers (2018) examined disclosure practices surrounding executive performance evaluation and pay, highlighting the importance of transparent criteria and meaningful links between compensation and performance for sound governance. Similarly, Charness et al. (2016), through laboratory-based experimental studies, demonstrated how different incentive structures affect worker behavior and productivity, offering evidence on how carefully designed rewards can shape performance in real-world labor settings. Scholars also caution that recognition systems must be designed and implemented thoughtfully. Benaine and Kroll (2019) warned that poorly crafted incentives may lead to "effort substitution" or data manipulation, while Neckermann et al. (2013) stressed that perceived fairness and clarity of communication largely determine whether awards programs genuinely motivate employees. Emerton and Jones (2019), focusing on the integration of sustainability metrics in performance targets and executive pay, showed how aligning rewards with broader environmental and social goals can influence organizational behavior and support corporate responsibility. Their work illustrates the growing expectation that performance and reward systems should promote not only financial results but also sustainable and socially responsive outcomes.



In the Philippine context, Manalo (2020) found that in many municipalities across Luzon, women and employees with shorter tenure often felt less recognized compared to male and longer-serving colleagues. These patterns suggest that demographic characteristics can shape both motivation and perceptions of equity within PRAISE implementation. Such findings underscore the need for LGUs to adopt gender-sensitive and tenure-aware recognition policies so that PRAISE genuinely reflects inclusivity and acknowledges diverse contributions. Taken together, classical management theories and contemporary motivation and governance frameworks point to recognition and rewards not as mere symbolic gestures but as strategic tools for long-term organizational development.

Within the LGUs of Santiago City, Cauayan City, and Ilagan City, the PRAISE system serves as a formal mechanism for commending employees who demonstrate outstanding performance and innovation. Among these, only Santiago and Cauayan have been certified by the CSC as having reached Maturity Level 2 (Process-Defined HRM) in Rewards and Recognition, indicating uneven implementation and perceived effectiveness across localities. Empirical evidence on how PRAISE awardees in these cities view the program's impact on their motivation, job satisfaction, and performance outcomes remains limited. By examining recognized employees from 2021 to 2023, this study seeks to identify key factors associated with their performance and to generate insights that can refine human resource management practices, reinforce motivation, and support sustainable organizational growth at the local government level.

Finally, the study's focus on PRAISE is also aligned with broader international development agendas. It contributes to SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) by promoting productive and rewarding work environments; to SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) by reinforcing accountability, transparency, and meritocracy in public service; and to SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) by advocating for inclusive recognition across employee categories. Addressing the present knowledge gap on how recognition programs influence employee behavior in the public sector is therefore not only a local HR concern but also a step toward building more effective, equitable, and sustainable public institutions.

## **Statement of the Problem**

Generally, this study aims to assess the employees' perceptions on the Programs on Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence (PRAISE) system of the three cities of the Province of Isabela as well as its contribution to enhancing employee's performance in the organization.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following:

1. To what extent are the perceptions of the respondents (Programs on Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence Recipients) on the PRAISE system relative to the following aspects:
  - 1.1 Mechanics;
  - 1.2 Criteria;
  - 1.3 Categories; and
  - 1.4 Prizes and incentives
  
2. To what extent are the perceptions on the employee's performance of the respondents (PRAISE Awardee's Supervisor/s) relative to the following aspects:
  - 2.1 Performance Targets;
  - 2.2 Character/Behavior;
  - 2.3 Attendance;
  - 2.4 Compliance; and
  - 2.5 Dimension of Employees Performance



## Research Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-comparative quantitative design to assess how the PRAISE system relates to employee performance across the three cities of Isabela. Using structured questionnaires, numerical data were systematically collected and statistically analyzed to describe respondent profiles, measure perceptions of the PRAISE system, and compare responses across demographic groupings. The respondents consisted of PRAISE awardees from 2021–2023 and their immediate supervisors from Santiago, Cauayan, and Ilagan, selected through purposive sampling based on their involvement in the PRAISE program. Two researcher-made survey instruments were used: one for awardees, focusing on demographic data and perceptions of PRAISE mechanics, criteria, categories, and incentives; and another for supervisors, assessing employee performance through dimensions such as targets, behavior, attendance, and compliance. Both instruments underwent expert validation, obtaining a high Content Validation Analysis score of 0.95, and pilot testing confirmed their reliability through high Cronbach's alpha results. After securing formal permission and respondents' consent, the questionnaires were personally distributed and retrieved, and all data were processed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS. Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, weighted mean) were used to profile respondents and summarize perceptions, while chi-square tests and Kendall's tau examined differences in responses across profile variables. Likert scales provided qualitative descriptions of observation levels, satisfaction, and performance ratings. Ethical procedures were strictly observed by ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and adherence to the Data Privacy Act. Overall, this methodology ensured accurate, valid, and ethical data collection to evaluate the effectiveness of the PRAISE system and its impact on employee performance in local government settings.

## Results and Findings

**Table 1: Perceptions of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Mechanics**

<b>Components of the PRAISE System</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Descriptive Equivalent</b>
<b>Mechanics</b>		
The search is open to all employees of the City Government of Santiago	2.88	Strictly Observed
Qualification is determined through nomination form	2.67	Strictly Observed
The PRAISE committee screen and evaluate the performance of all nominees	2.69	Strictly Observed
Awarding is done semi-annually, then annually	2.74	Strictly Observed
Semi-annually finalist served as the bases for the annual best awardees	2.69	Strictly Observed
Qualified nominees are acknowledged during Monday Flag Rites	2.21	Observed



Names of qualified nominees are posted on the bulletin board	2.31	Observed
<b>Grand Mean :</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>Strictly Observed</b>

*Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Observed; 2.50-3.00 = Strictly Observed*

The practical application of the PRAISE system in Santiago City Government shows effective implementation because officials complete their duties which include open nominations and committee screening and regular awarding procedures with an average score of 2.60. The organization follows CSC guidelines according to the obtained results. The system operates as a collection of procedures which organizations should follow because it does not create motivational effects.

Recognition systems achieve their highest effectiveness when employees find their operation to be fair and transparent and beneficial instead of seeing them as ordinary procedures. The two areas of public acknowledgment during flag rites (2.21) and posting of nominees' names (2.31), received slightly lower ratings because people required better ways to see and understand information. The organization loses all recognition because it disappears which leads to fewer people showing their commitment to the organization.

The PRAISE system operates properly for its administrative tasks however the system needs to improve its function of increasing workplace motivation and appreciation and employee morale. The system will become more engaging for staff through its new features which allow them to participate in nominations and provide feedback.

**Table 2: Perceptions of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Criteria**

Components of the PRAISE System	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
<b>Criteria</b>		
Employee's appointment must be valid at the time of nomination	2.90	Strictly Observed
Employee must have rendered six (6) months continuous service prior to the nomination period	2.70	Strictly Observed
Certification of the concerned office/s or Nomination/endorsement of the employee's immediate supervisor, peer or client is required	2.72	Strictly Observed
An employee must not have been found guilty of any criminal or administrative offense or a pending case	2.91	Strictly Observed
<b>Grand Mean :</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>Strictly Observed</b>

*Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Observed; 2.50-3.00 = Strictly Observed*

The table displays a strong compliance with PRAISE criteria which shows a grand mean score of 2.81 to indicate constant



adherence to Civil Service Commission standards for eligibility requirements and service continuity and endorsement procedures and moral integrity. The recognition process gives ethical standards high importance because it shows the highest rating for “no pending administrative or criminal case” at 2.91.

The strict requirement of qualifications creates an impediment for people who want to join because it gives preference to regular employees while extending discouragement toward individuals who work in temporary or contractual positions. The studies show that recognition systems produce better motivational outcomes when they recognize both compliance and the efforts and creative work and teamwork contributions of employees.

The criteria establish a system of fair evaluation which maintains credibility yet presents an opportunity for PRAISE enhancement through the introduction of standards which incorporate multiple assessment dimensions. The program would gain from this because it would enable improved recognition of all employee contributions which would lead to increased employee motivation and engagement.

**Table 3: Perceptions of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Categories**

Components of the PRAISE System	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
<b>Categories</b>		
All levels of employees are represented in the awards	2.91	Strictly Observed
Regular and non-regular employees are given the chance	2.93	Strictly Observed
<b>Grand Mean :</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>Strictly Observed</b>

Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Observed; 2.50-3.00 = Strictly Observed

Table 3 demonstrates that PRAISE award categories have the highest level of observation because they achieved a grand mean of 2.92 which stands as the top value across all measurement areas. The employees perceive the system as fair because it acknowledges both regular and non-regular workers in its operations. The strong ratings for representation and inclusion reflect the LGU’s effort to promote equal opportunity in recognition.

The office environment benefits from inclusivity because it provides workers with fair treatment which boosts their motivation while creating a collective goal between them. The assessment results show high scores which probably indicate response bias, thus requiring extra evaluation methods to verify study findings. The trust relationship needs maintenance through better transparency methods which should extend to award criteria and classification processes.

Table 4 shows that recipients of awards demonstrate high levels of satisfaction with both symbolic and monetary rewards which include plaques and certificates and cash incentives. The results show that employees achieve lower satisfaction levels with promotion benefits (2.39) and salary increases (2.22) which creates a recognition gap that hinders their ability to advance in their careers.



Table 4: Perceptions of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Prizes and Incentives

Table with 3 columns: Prizes and Incentives, Mean, and Descriptive Equivalent. Rows include Plaque or Trophy, Certificate of Recognition, Cash Incentives/Monetary Rewards, Performance-Based Salary Increase, Promotion in position, Additional Benefits or Perks, Public Recognition, and GRAND MEAN.

Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Satisfied; 2.50-3.00 = Highly Satisfied

Table 4 shows that PRAISE recipients were generally highly satisfied with symbolic and monetary rewards such as plaques or trophies (2.90), certificates (2.89), and cash incentives (2.89). However, they were only satisfied with career-related benefits like promotion (2.39) and performance-based salary increases (2.22), indicating a gap between recognition and professional growth opportunities.

These findings affirm Smith (2014) and Kube et al. (2018) who emphasized that symbolic rewards foster belongingness and motivation through reciprocity. Yet, the limited satisfaction with promotions echoes Neckermann and Frey (2013), who argued that recognition loses impact when not linked to tangible career advancement. Similarly, Dela Cruz (2020) found that many LGUs use PRAISE mainly as a morale-boosting tool rather than a career development mechanism.

Overall, while PRAISE effectively promotes morale through public and symbolic recognition, it remains weak in supporting long-term employee growth. Strengthening the system with clearer career incentives, as recommended by CSC (2019), can make PRAISE both motivational and developmental, ensuring sustained employee engagement and performance.

Table 5: Perceptions of the Supervisor on the Employees Performance

Table with 3 columns: INDICATORS, Mean, and Descriptive Equivalent. Section A: PERFORMANCE includes 6 indicators such as 'Always ready and prepared to work' and 'Works well as a team member/team leader'.



<b>GRAND MEAN</b>	<b>4.85</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>B. CHARACTER/BEHAVIOR</b>		
1. Has a good work ethics and applies them to duties	4.85	Excellent
2. Has a positive effect on co-workers and their performance	4.77	Excellent
3. Has a positive effect on clients in the delivery of public service	4.88	Excellent
4. Gladly take responsibility.	4.84	Excellent
5. Desire to do something before asking to do or others do.	4.84	Excellent
<b>GRAND MEAN</b>	<b>4.84</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>C. ATTENDANCE</b>		
1. Comes in early or on time or driving late or on time	4.77	Excellent
2. does not leave the office without prior notice	4.79	Excellent
3. Always at his/her official work station	4.82	Excellent
4. Present during flag raising and flag lowering	4.73	Excellent
5. Actively participating in different programs/activities of the City Government	4.76	Excellent
<b>GRAND MEAN</b>	<b>4.77</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>D. COMPLIANCE</b>		
1. Proper wearing of official office uniform and ID.	4.85	Excellent
2. Registering attendance through Biometric Machine.	4.71	Excellent
3. Observing time for snack/break and lunch.	4.63	Excellent
4. Wearing of ASEAN inspired attire every first Monday of the month.	4.71	Excellent
<b>GRAND MEAN</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>Excellent</b>

**Continuation- Table 5: Perceptions of the Supervisor on the Employees Performance**

INDICATORS	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
<b>E. DIMENSIONS OF EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE</b>		
1. Quality of Service: This indicator assesses the employee, including factors such as accuracy, completeness, timeliness of work and may involve evaluating the employee's ability to meet or exceed service standards and deliver high-quality results.	4.8	Excellent
2. Innovation and Creativity: This indicator measures the employee's ability to innovate and develop creative solutions to work-related challenges.	4.73	Excellent



3. Customer Satisfaction: This indicator evaluates the employee's impact on customer satisfaction levels, involving soliciting feedback from internal or external stakeholders.	4.84	Excellent
4. Teamwork and Collaboration: This indicator assesses the employee's ability to work effectively as part of a team and collaborate with colleagues to achieve common goals.	4.87	Excellent
5. Leadership and Initiative: This indicator measures the employee's leadership qualities and initiative in taking on additional responsibilities or spearheading projects, involving the employee's ability to motivate and inspire others, demonstrate initiative, and lead by example.	4.82	Excellent
6. Adherence to Values and Ethical Standards: This indicator assesses the employee's adherence to organizational values, ethics, and codes of conduct.	4.84	Excellent
7. Continuous Learning and Development: This indicator evaluates the employee's commitment to continuous learning and professional development, involving participation in training programs, acquisition of new skills or certifications, and application of learning to improve job performance.	4.9	Excellent
<b>GRAND MEAN</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>Excellent</b>

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Excellent

Table 5 reveals that supervisors rated employees **Excellent** across all dimensions—Performance, Character, Attendance, Compliance, and Overall Work Dimensions—with grand means ranging from **4.73 to 4.85**. This suggests a highly competent and dependable workforce.

In terms of performance, employees were viewed as well-prepared, knowledgeable, and quality-driven ( $M = 4.85$ ). This supports Hauer et al. (2016) and De Vera (2018), who emphasized that public service excellence depends on both technical skills and behavioral competence. However, the consistently high ratings may indicate a **halo effect**, where supervisors hesitate to rate lower, as noted by Hartmann and Schreck (2018).

For character and behavior, employees showed strong work ethics and initiative ( $M = 4.85$ ). This reflects the value of ethical conduct in government service, though **Reyes and Medina (2020)** cautioned that high behavioral ratings might stem from cultural tendencies to maintain workplace harmony.

Under attendance and compliance, results were also excellent ( $M = 4.84$  and  $4.77$ ), showing punctuality and adherence to rules. These findings align with **Lee (2017)**, who linked high attendance with performance-based incentives. Yet, slightly lower ratings on break observance suggest minor inconsistencies in discipline.

Across the dimensions of employee performance, the highest mean was for Continuous Learning and Development ( $M = 4.90$ ), implying strong motivation for growth, consistent with De Vera (2018). However, Innovation and Creativity ( $M = 4.73$ ) was rated lowest, reflecting the challenge noted by Reyes and Medina (2020) that LGUs often value compliance over innovation.



The findings show a workforce committed to quality and accountability, but overly positive ratings may hide subtle weaknesses. Continuous training for supervisors, balanced evaluation metrics, and recognition of innovation can enhance the credibility and developmental purpose of PRAISE, **promoting** good governance and SDG 16 goals for strong institutions.

Table 10 reveals the significant difference in the Perceptions of PRAISE Recipients on the Mechanics, Criteria, and Categories of PRAISE when Grouped by Sex. The data reveal that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of components when grouped according to their Sex.

**Table 10: Difference in the Perception of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Components when Grouped according to their Sex**

Components of the PRAISE System	Male		Female		t-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
<b>Mechanics</b>						
1. The search is open to all employees of the City Government of Santiago	2.90	SO	2.86	SO	.64 <sup>ns</sup>	.52
2. Qualification is determined through nomination form	2.60	SO	2.73	SO	-1.60 <sup>ns</sup>	.11
3. The PRAISE committee screen and evaluate the performance of all nominees	2.67	SO	2.71	SO	-.51 <sup>ns</sup>	.60
4. Awarding is done semi-annually, then annually	2.69	SO	2.78	SO	-1.26 <sup>ns</sup>	.20
5. Semi-annually finalist served as the bases for the annual best awardees	2.67	SO	2.71	SO	-.48 <sup>ns</sup>	.62
6. Qualified nominees are acknowledged during Monday Flag Rites	2.20	0	2.22	0	-.13 <sup>ns</sup>	.89
7. Names of qualified nominees are posted on the bulletin board	2.28	0	2.34	0	-.38 <sup>ns</sup>	.69
<b>Criteria</b>						
8. Employee's appointment must be valid at the time of nomination	2.93	SO	2.88	SO	1.04 <sup>ns</sup>	.29
9. Employee must have rendered six (6) months continuous service prior to the nomination period	2.71	SO	2.69	SO	.18 <sup>ns</sup>	.85
10. Certification of the concerned office/s or Nomination/endorsement of the employee's immediate supervisor, peer or client is required	2.69	SO	2.75	SO	-.69 <sup>ns</sup>	.48
11. An employee must not have been found guilty of any criminal or administrative offense or a pending case	2.95	SO	2.86	SO	1.70 <sup>ns</sup>	.09
<b>Categories</b>						



12. All levels of employees are represented in the awards	2.93	SO	2.89	SO	.79 <sup>ns</sup>	.43
13. Regular and non-regular employees are given the chance	2.97	SO	2.89	SO	1.93 <sup>ns</sup>	.06

Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Observed (O); 2.50-3.00 = Strictly Observed (SO); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

PRAISE recipients when grouped according to sex. Both male and female employees demonstrated comparable levels of satisfaction regarding the mechanics, criteria, and categories of the PRAISE system.

This finding implies that the program’s implementation is gender-neutral and equitably designed, reinforcing the Civil Service Commission’s (CSC, 2017) mandate for fairness and inclusivity in employee recognition. Mun and Kodama (2022) observed that transparent recognition frameworks help reduce gender-based disparities in perceived organizational justice, a notion supported by this study’s results. However, this uniformity may also suggest that PRAISE does not sufficiently account for gender-specific motivational needs a potential area for HR enhancement.

**Table 6: Difference in the Perception of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Prizes and Incentives when Grouped according to their Sex**

Prizes and Incentives	Male		Female		t-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. Plaque or Trophy	2.91	HS	2.89	HS	.48 <sup>ns</sup>	.63
2. Certificate of Recognition	2.87	HS	2.90	HS	-.57 <sup>ns</sup>	.56
3. Cash Incentives/Monetary Rewards	2.90	HS	2.89	HS	.17 <sup>ns</sup>	.86
4. Performance-Based Salary Increase	2.09	S	2.34	S	-1.79 <sup>ns</sup>	.07
5. Promotion in position	2.47	S	2.31	S	1.33 <sup>ns</sup>	.18
6. Additional Benefits or Perks	2.45	S	2.31	S	1.09 <sup>ns</sup>	.27
7. Public Recognition	2.84	HS	2.78	HS	.90 <sup>ns</sup>	.36

Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Satisfied (S); 2.50-3.00 = Highly Satisfied (HS); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

Table 6 reveals the significant difference in the Perceptions of PRAISE Recipients on Prizes and Incentives when Grouped by Sex. Findings indicate no significant variation between male and female respondents in their assessment of PRAISE’s prizes and incentives. Both groups expressed high satisfaction toward symbolic rewards such as plaques and certificates but moderate satisfaction toward monetary incentives and promotions.

This outcome supports the argument of Neckermann and Frey (2013) that recognition, when not directly tied to career advancement or financial rewards, retains strong symbolic value but limited motivational effect. These results suggest that both male and female employees value intrinsic acknowledgment more than material gain,



aligning with Ryan and Deci's (2017) self-determination theory emphasizing intrinsic motivation.

Table 7 reveals the significant difference in the Perceptions of PRAISE Recipients on the Mechanics, Criteria, and Categories of PRAISE when Grouped by Age. The analysis reveals that while most age groups shared similar perceptions of the PRAISE system, significant differences appeared in the criterion requiring six months of continuous service before eligibility. Younger employees, particularly those with less tenure, rated this condition lower, perceiving it as restrictive.

**Table 7: Difference in the Perception of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Components when Grouped according to their Age**

Components of the PRAISE System	18-30		31-45		46 and above		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
<b>Mechanics</b>								
1. The search is open to all employees of the City Government of Santiago	3.00	S0	2.88	S0	2.87	S0	.74 <sup>ns</sup>	.47
2. Qualification is determined through nomination form	2.83	S0	2.57	S0	2.71	S0	1.96 <sup>ns</sup>	.14
3. The PRAISE committee screen and evaluate the performance of all nominees	2.83	S0	2.64	S0	2.70	S0	.90 <sup>ns</sup>	.40
4. Awarding is done semi-annually, then annually	2.83	S0	2.67	S0	2.78	S0	1.22 <sup>ns</sup>	.29
5. Semi-annually finalist served as the bases for the annual best awardees	2.41	0	2.69	S0	2.73	S0	2.15 <sup>ns</sup>	.11
6. Qualified nominees are acknowledged during Monday Flag Rites	1.75	0	2.18	0	2.30	0	2.47 <sup>ns</sup>	.08
7. Names of qualified nominees are posted on the bulletin board	2.00	0	2.30	0	2.37	0	.99 <sup>ns</sup>	.37
<b>Criteria</b>								
8. Employee's appointment must be valid at the time of nomination	3.00	S0	2.91	S0	2.88	S0	.85 <sup>ns</sup>	.42
9. Employee must have rendered six (6) months continuous service prior to the nomination period	2.75	S0	2.57	S0	2.79	S0	3.57*	.03



10. Certification of the concerned office/s or Nomination/endorsement of the employee's immediate supervisor, peer or client is required	2.75	SO	2.64	SO	2.78	SO	1.62 <sup>ns</sup>	.20
11. An employee must not have been found guilty of any criminal or administrative offense or a pending case	3.00	SO	2.94	SO	2.87	SO	1.40 <sup>ns</sup>	.24
<b>Categories</b>								
12. All levels of employees are represented in the awards	3.00	SO	2.93	SO	2.88	SO	1.09 <sup>ns</sup>	.33
13. Regular and non-regular employees are given the chance	3.00	SO	2.93	SO	2.92	SO	.48 <sup>ns</sup>	.61

Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Observed (O); 2.50-3.00 = Strictly Observed (SO); \* = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

This is consistent with Charness et al. (2016), who argued that younger workers often seek faster feedback and recognition cycles. Conversely, older employees viewed the requirement as a measure of commitment and stability. The finding reflects generational differences in work expectations and calls for policy refinement to balance inclusivity and organizational discipline.

**Table 8: Difference in the Perception of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Prizes and Incentives when Grouped according to their Age**

Prizes and Incentives	18-30		31-45		46 and above		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. Plaque or Trophy	3.00	HS	2.91	HS	2.88	HS	.85 <sup>ns</sup>	.42
2. Certificate of Recognition	3.00	HS	2.88	HS	2.88	HS	.68 <sup>ns</sup>	.50
3. Cash Incentives/Monetary Rewards	2.83	HS	2.93	HS	2.88	HS	.63 <sup>ns</sup>	.53
4. Performance-Based Salary Increase	1.75	S	2.28	S	2.24	S	2.10 <sup>ns</sup>	.12
5. Promotion in position	2.33	S	2.54	HS	2.29	S	1.88 <sup>ns</sup>	.15
6. Additional Benefits or Perks	2.25	S	2.61	HS	2.23	S	4.61*	.01
7. Public Recognition	2.58	HS	2.89	HS	2.79	HS	3.43*	.03

Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Satisfied (S); 2.50-3.00 = Highly Satisfied (HS); \* = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

Table 8 reveals the significant difference in the Perceptions of PRAISE Recipients on Prizes and Incentives when Grouped by Age. Results show minor variations in satisfaction with prizes and incentives across age groups. Younger employees expressed higher appreciation for public recognition and non-monetary rewards, while older respondents favored financial or position-based incentives.



This difference aligns with Manalo (2020), who noted that intrinsic rewards tend to resonate more with early-career professionals, whereas extrinsic motivators become more valued with seniority. The implication for PRAISE is the need to diversify its incentive structures to address the motivational diversity across generational cohorts, ensuring that recognition remains relevant and equitable.

**Table 9: Difference in the Perception of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Components when Grouped according to their Years in the Service**

Components of the PRAISE System	Below 5 years		10-Jun years		15-Nov years		16-20 years		21 years and above		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
	<b>Mechanics</b>											
1. The search is open to all employees of the City Government of Santiago	3	SO	2.94		2.89		2.77		2.84		1.25 <sub>ns</sub>	0.29
2. Qualification is determined through nomination form	2.5	SO	2.67	SO	2.59	SO	2.77	SO	2.75	SO	.96 <sub>ns</sub>	0.42
3. The PRAISE committee screen and evaluate the performance of all nominees	2.5	SO	2.7	SO	2.69	SO	2.63	SO	2.75	SO	.58 <sub>ns</sub>	0.67
4. Awarding is done semi-annually, then annually	2.62	SO	2.78	SO	2.71	SO	2.68	SO	2.81	SO	.62 <sub>ns</sub>	0.64
5. Semi-annually finalist served as the bases for the annual best awardees	2.37	0	2.64	SO	2.69	SO	2.81	SO	2.72	SO	1.31 <sub>ns</sub>	0.26
6. Qualified nominees are acknowledged during Monday Flag Rites	1.75	0	2.18	0	2.16	0	2.27	0	2.39	0	1.10 <sub>ns</sub>	0.35
7. Names of qualified nominees are posted on the bulletin board	2.12	0	2.29	0	2.32	0	2.22	0	2.42	0	.29 <sub>ns</sub>	0.88

**Continuation-Table 9: Difference in the Perception of the PRAISE Recipients on the PRAISE System in terms of Components when Grouped according to their Years in the Service**



Components of the PRAISE System	Below 5 years		10-Jun years		15-Nov years		16-20 Years		21 years and above		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
<b>Categories</b>												
12. All levels of employees are represented in the awards	3	SO	2.94	SO	2.89	SO	2.9	SO	2.87	SO	.46 <sup>ns</sup>	0.76
13. Regular and non-regular employees are given the chance	3	SO	2.94	SO	2.91	SO	3	SO	2.87	SO	.98 <sup>ns</sup>	0.41

*Legend: 1.50-2.49 = Observed (O); 2.50-3.00 = Strictly Observed (SO); ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Table 9 reveals the significant difference in the Perceptions of PRAISE Recipients on the Mechanics, Criteria, and Categories of PRAISE when Grouped by Years in Service. The findings suggest that employees, regardless of tenure, generally perceive the PRAISE system as well-implemented. No significant difference was noted, implying that the program is applied consistently across service groups. However, employees with longer tenure exhibited slightly higher satisfaction with procedural transparency, suggesting trust built through repeated exposure to the process.

This supports De Vera's (2018) recommendation for integrating both quantitative and qualitative indicators in LGU appraisals to ensure perceived fairness and inclusivity in performance evaluation systems.

**Conclusion**

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

The PRAISE system of the City Government of Santiago is procedurally strong and highly compliant with CSC guidelines. Mechanics and criteria are strictly observed, indicating that the search, nomination, screening, and awarding processes are clearly institutionalized and consistently implemented. The criteria, particularly the emphasis on valid appointment, continuous service, and absence of administrative or criminal cases, reinforce merit, integrity, and accountability in the recognition process.

The system is also perceived as inclusive in terms of award categories, with both regular and non-regular employees and all levels of staff reportedly given opportunities for recognition. This suggests that PRAISE has evolved into a more democratic mechanism that supports equal recognition across employment status and ranks, thereby



enhancing perceptions of fairness and representation among employees.

In terms of rewards, PRAISE effectively boosts morale through symbolic and monetary recognition, as recipients are highly satisfied with plaques, certificates, cash incentives, and public acknowledgment. However, only moderate satisfaction with promotion, salary increases, and additional benefits indicates that PRAISE is stronger as a morale and recognition tool than as a driver of long-term career development. This reveals a gap between short-term appreciation and sustained professional growth.

Supervisors rate PRAISE awardees as Excellent across performance, behavior, attendance, compliance, and broader performance dimensions, portraying a workforce that is competent, ethical, reliable, and committed to continuous learning. At the same time, slightly lower ratings in innovation and minor variations in compliance suggest that creativity and strict observance of some rules can still be improved. The uniformly high ratings also hint at possible rating leniency or halo effects in performance appraisal.

Finally, perceptions of PRAISE are generally consistent across sex and years in service, indicating that the system is applied in a gender-neutral and tenure-consistent manner. Differences by age and generational cohort are minor but meaningful: younger employees tend to be more sensitive to eligibility requirements and respond more to public and intrinsic recognition, while older employees value material and career-related incentives more. Overall, PRAISE is viewed as a credible, fair, and motivating recognition system, but its full potential as a developmental and strategic HR tool remains partially underutilized.

## References

- Adaobi, C. C., & Owusuaa-Konadu, C. (2022). Employees training and development on organizational performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 5(9), 749–764. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v5-i9-30>
- Benaine, S. L., & Kroll, A. (2019). Designing effective recognition and incentive systems: Avoiding unintended consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(5), 523–540. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2345>
- Benaine, S. L., & Kroll, A. (2019). Explaining effort substitution in performance systems: The role of task demands and mission orientation. *Public Management Review*, 1–23.
- Cadiz, R., & Dizon, M. (2021). Evaluating PRAISE-based incentive programs in Philippine local government units: Balancing monetary and non-monetary rewards. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 65(2), 112–130.
- Chapman, G., & White, P. (2012). *Workplace. SHRM/Globeforce employee recognition survey, Fall 2012*.
- Cheon, G., & Cheon, Y. (2018). A study on the effects of compliments on the ex-post responses of hotel employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(8), 823–832.
- Civil Service Commission. (2019). *PRAISE policy brief: Implementation of the Program on Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence in local government units*. Civil Service Commission. <https://www.csc.gov.ph>
- De Vera, J. (2018). Integrating qualitative and quantitative indicators in LGU performance appraisal systems. *Philippine Management Review*, 25(1), 45–61.



Dela Cruz, P. (2020). *The implementation of PRAISE in selected government offices in Region II: Perceptions on fairness and effectiveness* (Unpublished master's thesis). Isabela State University, Echague Campus.

Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 949–969.

Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2022). *Performance governance in LGUs: PRAISE and beyond*. DILG Publications. <https://www.dilg.gov.ph>

Emerton, P., & Jones, A. (2019). Perceptions of the efficacy of sustainability-related performance conditions in executive pay schemes. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 9(1), 1–16.

Erwin Dekker, B., Remic, B., & Dalla Chiesa, C. (2019). Incentives matter, but what do they mean? Understanding the meaning of market coordination. *Review of Political Economy*.

Froese, F. J., Peltokorpi, V., & Ko, K. (2018). Perceptions of fairness in merit-based reward systems: Effects on job satisfaction and retention. *Human Resource Management*, 57(6), 1451–1466. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21956>

Hartmann, F., & Schreck, P. (2018). Rankings, performance, and sabotage: The moderating effects of target setting. *European Accounting Review*, 27(2), 363–382.

Hauer, G., Kroll, J., Yen, D. C., Chen, P. S., & Lin, S. C. (2016). A performance measurement framework for service-oriented marketing. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 27(11–12), 1373–1395.

Hauer, T., Rauthmann, J. F., & Schmitt, M. (2016). A multidimensional approach to performance evaluation: Behavioral, process, and learning metrics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(3), 345–359. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000063>

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Jones, R. G., Sharpe, D. L., & Wiseman, D. (2019). The impact of employee incentive programs on customer satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(3), 353–369.

Kadarisman, M. (2019). The influence of compensation, development, and supervision towards the performance of civil servants in Depok City Government, Indonesia. *Cogent Psychology*, 6(1), 1620402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2019.1620402>

Kohn, A. (2013). Why incentive plans cannot work. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/1993/09/why-incentive-plans-cannot-work>

Kube, S., Marechal, M. A., & Puppe, C. (2018). The currency of reciprocity: Gift exchange in the workplace. *American Economic Review*, 108(8), 2187–2201.



Lee, G. (2017). Performance-oriented managerial practices and job attitude in public organizations. *International Review of Public Administration*, 22(3), 245–256.

Mans-Kemp, N., & Viviers, S. (2018). Executive performance evaluation and remuneration: Disclosure and practices of selected listed South African companies (2002–2015). *South African Journal of Accounting Research*, 32(2–3), 154–173.

Manalo, R. (2020). *Recognition and gender disparities among municipal personnel in Luzon: A study of PRAISE implementation* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Diliman.

Mun, E., & Kodama, N. (2022). Meritocracy at work?: Merit-based reward systems and gender wage inequality. *Social Forces*, 100(4), 1561–1591.

Mun, S., & Kodama, M. (2022). Gender and age differences in access to recognition and performance-based rewards. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(7), 1402–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1769472>

Neckermann, S., & Frey, B. S. (2013). And the winner is...? The motivating power of employee awards. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 46, 66–77.

Neckermann, S., Dufner, M., & Frey, B. S. (2013). The impact of fairness and transparency on employee recognition. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 36, 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2013.03.003>

Obeidat, B. Y. (2016). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility, employee engagement, and organizational performance: The case of Jordanian mobile telecommunication companies. *International Journal of Communications, Network and System Sciences*, 9(9), 361–386.

Philippine Civil Service Commission. (n.d.). PRAISE system. <https://www.csc.gov.ph/pcser/praise-system/>

Pun, K. F., & White, A. S. (2005). A performance measurement paradigm for integrating strategy formulation: A review of systems and frameworks. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(1), 49–71.

Rees, D. I., & Schone, P. (2017). Incentives for teacher relocation: Evidence from the Gambian hardship allowance. *Journal of Development Economics*, 124, 1–12.

Reyes, C., & Medina, L. (2020). Supervisory practices in LGU performance evaluation: Compliance versus innovation. *Philippine Journal of Public Management*, 51(1), 78–95.

Smith, C. L. (2014). *Employee recognition at work: A study of employee experiences* (Doctoral dissertation, University of York).

Smith, K. (2014). *Recognition at work: Building belongingness and solidarity in organizations*. Routledge.

Stanleigh, M. (2015). *Measuring your organization's performance*. Business Improvement Architects. <https://bia.ca/measuring-your-organizations-performance/>



**Journal of Social Transformation, Governance and  
Cultural Studies (JSTGC)**

**e-ISSN 3116-2916**

**<https://jstgc.minduraresearch.com/journal/index>**

Submitted: 1/1/2026 | Accepted: 2/5/2026 | Published: 3/30/2026

Van Knippenberg, D. (2000). Work motivation and performance: A social identity perspective. *Applied Psychology, 49*(3), 357–371.